

JANUARY - FEBRUARY 1981

TWENTY-FIRST YEAR — No. 220

27 MAY 1981



international review of the red cross



INTER ARMA CARITAS

GENEVA

**INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS
FOUNDED IN 1863**

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

- Mr. ALEXANDRE HAY, Lawyer, former Director-General of the Swiss National Bank, *President* (member since 1975)
- Mr. HARALD HÜBER, Doctor of Laws, Federal Court Judge, *Vice-President* (1969)
- Mr. RICHARD PESTALOZZI, Doctor of Laws, *Vice-President* (1977)
- Mr. JEAN PICTET, Doctor of Laws, former Vice-President of the ICRC (1967)
- Mrs. DENISE BINDSCHIEDLER-ROBERT, Doctor of Laws, Professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Judge at the European Court of Human Rights (1967)
- Mr. MARCEL A. NAVILLE, Master of Arts, ICRC President from 1969 to 1973 (1967)
- Mr. JACQUES F. DE ROUGEMONT, Doctor of Medicine (1967)
- Mr. VICTOR H. UMBRIGHT, Doctor of Laws, Managing Director (1970)
- Mr. GILBERT ETIENNE, Professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies and at the Institut d'études du développement, Geneva (1973)
- Mr. ULRICH MIDDENDORP, Doctor of Medicine, head of surgical department of the Cantonal Hospital, Winterthur (1973)
- Mrs. MARION BOVÉE-ROTHENBACH, Doctor of Sociology (1973)
- Mr. HANS PETER TSCHUDI, Doctor of Laws, former Swiss Federal Councillor (1973)
- Mr. HENRY HUGUENIN, Banker (1974)
- Mr. JAKOB BURCKHARDT, Doctor of Laws, Minister Plenipotentiary (1975)
- Mr. THOMAS FLEINER, Master of Laws, Professor at the University of Fribourg (1975)
- Mr. ATHOS GALLINO, Doctor of Medicine, Mayor of Bellinzona (1977)
- Mr. ROBERT KOHLER, Master of Economics (1977)
- Mr. MAURICE AUBERT, Doctor of Laws, Banker (1979)
- Mr. RUDOLF JÄCKLI, Doctor of Sciences, Geologist (1979)
- Miss ANDRÉE WEITZEL, former head of the women's auxiliary service at the Federal Military Department (1979)
- Mr. OLIVIER LONG, Doctor of Laws and Doctor of Political Science, Ambassador, former Director General of GATT (1980)
- Mr. DIETRICH SCHINDLER, Doctor of Laws, Professor at the University of Zürich (1961-1973; 1980)
-

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

- Mr. ALEXANDRE HAY, *President*
- Mr. RICHARD PESTALOZZI
- Mr. JAKOB BURCKHARDT
- Mr. ATHOS GALLINO
- Mr. RUDOLF JÄCKLI
- Miss ANDRÉE WEITZEL
-

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL
COMMITTEE OF
THE RED CROSS

IN THE RED CROSS
WORLD

MISCELLANEOUS

BOOKS AND REVIEWS

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW
OF THE RED CROSS

ISSN 0020-8604

January - February 1981 — No. 220

Yves Sandoz: A new step forward in international law—Prohibitions and restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons	3
<hr/>	
President of ICRC and Executive Board re-elected	19
Ratification of the Protocols	19
Declarations of accession and of succession to the Protocol for the prohibition of asphyxiating gases	20
Declaration of intent by the African National Congress	20
ICRC Radiocommunications in 1980	21
<i>External activities:</i>	
Africa—Latin America—Asia—Middle East	22
<hr/>	
The Lebanese Red Cross today	36
<hr/>	
United Nations Conference on prohibitions or restrictions of use of certain conventional weapons: Final act—Convention—Protocols I, II, III—Resolution	41
<hr/>	
Protection of war victims (Howard S. Levic)	56

International Review of the Red Cross is published by the International Committee of the Red Cross. It first appeared in French in 1869.

As the official organ of the ICRC, specializing in international humanitarian law and recording the international activities of the Red Cross, *International Review of the Red Cross* provides a constant flow of information and constitutes the necessary link between the members of the International Red Cross.

International Review of the Red Cross appears once every two months in three languages:

in English: INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS (from 1961)

in French: REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE LA CROIX-ROUGE

in Spanish: REVISTA INTERNACIONAL DE LA CRUZ ROJA (from 1976)

It also publishes, in German, a short edition, *Extracts*, of various articles which appear in the main editions.

EDITOR: Michel Testuz

ADDRESS: International Review of the Red Cross
17, Avenue de la Paix
CH - 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

SUBSCRIPTIONS: one year, Sw. frs. 30.—; single copy Sw. frs. 5.—
Extracts in German: one year, Sw. frs. 10.—; single copy
Sw. frs. 2.—

Postal Cheque Account: No. 12 - 1767 Geneva

Bank account No. 129.986 Swiss Bank Corporation, Geneva

*The International Committee of the Red Cross assumes responsibility
only for material over its own signature.*

A new step forward in international law:

PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS

by Yves Sandoz

I. INTRODUCTION

On 10 October 1980, the "United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects" ended with the adoption by consensus of the following instruments:

- Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons,
- Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I),
- Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II),
- Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons (Protocol III).

In addition, at its first session, the Conference had adopted a Resolution on small-calibre weapon systems. All these texts are reproduced in this issue of the *Review*. It should also be pointed out that the Conference took note of six draft resolutions and one proposition which it will submit in its report to the UN General Assembly.

We propose here to give an account of the stages which led up to the successful outcome of the Conference; to indicate the place of the Convention and the three Protocols in international law; to analyse briefly the contents of the instruments and the Resolution adopted by the Conference, and of the different motions and propositions; and finally, to attempt to assess the influence of this accord in humanitarian terms.

II. BACKGROUND

The Second World War clearly showed the necessity of ensuring better protection for the civilian population during armed conflicts. The Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 represents a great advance in this respect, but is essentially concerned with the population in the hands of an enemy Power. The general protection of civilians against the effects of hostilities is still inadequately covered by this Convention. The ICRC soon realized this, and as early as September 1956 it drew up a set of "Draft Rules for the Limitation of the Dangers Incurred by the Civilian Population in Time of War". These rules included a chapter on weapons, entitled "Weapons with Uncontrollable Effects", proposing, in particular, that weapons whose harmful effects might escape the control of those using them and delayed-action weapons should be banned, and that belligerent parties making use of mines should be obliged to chart minfields and, at the cessation of active hostilities, to hand over the charts to the authorities responsible for the safety of the population. This proposal was presented in 1957 to the Nineteenth International Red Cross Conference which requested the ICRC to submit it to governments.

This move towards a further development of international humanitarian law was premature, however, since many States were still not parties to the Geneva Conventions.

The matter was taken up again in 1965, at the Twentieth International Red Cross Conference which in its Resolution XXVIII pointed out that "indiscriminate war constitutes a danger to the civilian population and the future of civilization" and that "the right of parties to a conflict to adopt means of injuring the enemy is not unlimited". The International Conference on Human Rights, held in Tcheran in 1968, voiced similar anxieties, and the United Nations General Assembly, in Resolution 2444, adopted the principles which these Conferences established on the subject.

In the report on the reaffirmation and development of the laws and customs applicable in armed conflicts presented to the Twenty-first International Red Cross Conference in 1969, the ICRC set forth as its principal conclusions that the belligerents should abstain from using weapons:

- likely to cause unnecessary suffering;
- which, because of their lack of precision or their effects, affect civilians and combatants without distinction;
- whose harmful effects were beyond the control, in time or space, of those employing them.

The Conference requested the ICRC to continue its efforts in this field.

In the same period, studies on the subject were published by the UN Secretariat and again by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

In 1971 and 1972, the ICRC organized a Conference of Government Experts on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law applicable in Armed Conflicts.

The documentation presented to the Conference dealt with protection of the civilian population in time of armed conflicts and, in particular, with protection against certain types of bombing and against the effects of certain weapons. While not inviting the experts to discuss "prohibitions of specific weapons", so as not to overlap the work of bodies concerned with disarmament, the ICRC thought it possible for them to examine, in addition to general principles, the principles relating to weapons which in any case, owing to their effects or their lack of precision, might affect the civilian population indiscriminately. The experts' opinions fell into three categories. According to the first, the problem of weapons ought not to be dealt with by such a body. The second felt that, without dealing directly with the question of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, biological, chemical), the necessity of banning them should be affirmed, since greater protection for the civilian population largely depended on such a ban. The third current of opinion held that the Conference should not consider weapons of mass destruction—under discussion by the Conference of the Disarmament Committee—but other particularly cruel weapons which were not being studied anywhere else.

This third tendency won the day, and at the second session of the Conference, in 1972, the experts of nineteen States asked the ICRC to organize a special meeting to consult legal, military and medical experts

on the question of the explicit prohibition or restriction of conventional weapons likely to cause unnecessary suffering or to have indiscriminate effects. This consultation took place in Geneva in 1973. A purely documentary report was produced, without formulating any specific proposals. Its role was to stimulate further studies on the subject, and it was distributed to all National Red Cross Societies, all the governments of States parties to the Geneva Conventions and all the relevant non-governmental organizations.

The draft of the Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions, as presented to the Diplomatic Conference which met in Geneva in 1974, contained general principles applying to weapons but no provisions on the use of any specific weapon. The Conference nevertheless set up an *ad hoc* Committee to deal with the problem. Again, the prevailing view was that the Committee's work should be restricted to conventional weapons.¹ With the encouragement of the Diplomatic Conference, the ICRC organized a Conference of Government Experts, which held two sessions, one at Lucerne in September-October 1974, the other in Lugano in January-February 1976.

Like the *ad hoc* Committee of the Diplomatic Conference, the experts discussed various conventional weapons; but in the end no article on the subject of a specific weapon was included in the Protocols. An article envisaging the creation of a committee on the prohibition or restriction of certain conventional weapons, whose task would have been to examine definite proposals on the matter and to prepare agreements, was dropped as it failed, by a few votes, to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

However, a resolution was adopted by the Diplomatic Conference (Resolution 22) recommending, *inter alia*, "that a Conference of Governments should be convened not later than 1979 with a view to reaching agreements on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of specific conventional weapons" and "agreement on a mechanism for the review of any such agreements and for the consideration of proposals for further such agreements".

The UN General Assembly supported this recommendation (see Res. 31/52 of 19 Dec. 1977, 33/70 of 28 Sept. 1978 and 34/82 of 11 Dec. 1979), and the proposed Conference, the subject of the present article, after a preparatory Conference which met in August-September 1978 and March-April 1979, took place in Geneva from 10 to 28 September 1979 and from 15 September to 10 October 1980.

¹ This expression covers all weapons not included in the category of "nuclear, biological or chemical" weapons.

III. CONTEXT

The specific prohibition of certain weapons belongs to two branches of international law, disarmament law and international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts. This dual relationship is not unimportant, since each of these laws approaches problems differently.

In matters of disarmament, stress is laid on problems of security. The aim is to proceed steadily toward general and total disarmament, without any sudden disruption in the balance of forces at some stage in the proceedings jeopardizing the security of the various States. Moreover, agreements on disarmament should cover not only prohibitions or restrictions on the use of any weapon, but also on its manufacture, storage and sale or purchase. In short, it should deal not merely with the use of a weapon but with its possession.

Problems of security are not entirely disregarded by international humanitarian law, but in that context they do not have the vital interest which they possess in relation to disarmament. The aim of international humanitarian law is, in fact, a modest one: "humanize" as far as possible those armed conflicts which cannot be avoided. Since it is by its nature subsidiary, operating only when the law prohibiting the use of force has failed to fulfil its role, international humanitarian law cannot claim to be a substitute for the other. It would be unrealistic to think that conflicts could be prevented by laying down such severe limits on means of combat that conflict would be made impossible. There is no reason whatever why such an obstacle should prove any stronger than that formed by the law prohibiting the use of force.

It is therefore imperative for international humanitarian law to confine itself to modest objectives. True, it has had its failures; but there have also been undeniable successes, and these have been due essentially to the fact that its provisions are of humanitarian interest to everybody while harming the military interests of nobody.

The considerations outlined above also apply in connection with weapons. It is highly unlikely that States will accept, as part of international humanitarian law, the prohibition of weapons of strategic importance which bedevil all discussions on disarmament. On the other hand, there are some weapons the possession of which does not materially affect the balance of forces in the world, and which are not essential from the military viewpoint, but whose effects are particularly cruel or cause extensive damage without military justification. Hence some people have remarked, understandably, that international humanitarian law should be satisfied with prohibiting useless weapons. Yet in the long

run this is not as ironic as it seems. Obviously, if the only effect of international humanitarian law on armed conflicts were to prevent any use of force not strictly justified by military necessity, it would still save a great many lives and much suffering. However, the urgent need to improve the protection of the civilian population led the States, in the 1977 Protocols, to go further and agree to take humanitarian factors into account even at the sacrifice of some military advantage. The same could be said of the Conference on conventional weapons. But it should never be forgotten that it is not in the interests of international humanitarian law to venture too far in this direction. To force the pace might well lead to catastrophe.

Yet such considerations should not be understood as a suggestion to give up all efforts in this sphere. Nor should it be thought, as is sometimes the case, that military necessity is used as a pretext to reject any new humanitarian measure.

IV. CONTENT

As the Convention and its three Protocols are appended to this article, we will not go into their contents in detail.

A few items, however, seem to be worthy of close study.

1. The Convention

The scope of the Convention was established by reference to the Geneva Conventions and to Protocol I additional to them. This means international conflicts, with the understanding that it includes "armed conflicts in which peoples are fighting against colonial domination and alien occupation and against racist regimes in the exercise of their right of self-determination".

The date on which the Convention comes into force will be six months after the date of receipt of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. It will be noted that there is a disparity between these instruments and the Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, for which only two instruments of ratification or accession are sufficient. This disparity is explained by the fact that some States placed the debate in the sphere of disarmament. Any agreement in this sphere aimed at reducing the level of armaments and thus diminishing the military power of States can obviously be envisaged only if it is applied by all States or, at the least, by all the military Powers.

Observance of the Conventions belonging to international humanitarian law, on the other hand, should have no effect on the military efficiency of the States involved. But even if these instruments on conventional weapons are applicable only between parties to a conflict which have accepted them, it may be assumed that States which decide to ratify or accede to these instruments will forgo possession of the weapons they prohibit. These, while not of vital importance from the strategic viewpoint, still have implications for security, according to some States, who consequently demanded substantial support for the Convention and the Protocols before their entry into force. The figure of twenty is therefore a compromise between the States which held this view and those which unreservedly associated these instruments with international humanitarian law.

Another point to be noted is that a State cannot become party to the Convention alone; this is logical, since the Convention merely provides the legal framework within which the prohibitions contained in the Protocols are applicable. But the conditions fixed go further: a State becoming a party to the Convention must accept at least *two* of the Protocols. This requirement was aimed mainly at preventing any State from becoming a party only to Protocol I, which is at present of little practical significance (see below).

An interesting aspect is the system of relationships established when the Convention takes effect; the same flexible system as for the Geneva Conventions. A State which is party to the Convention is obliged not only to observe it with respect to another State also party to the Convention and having an ally not bound by it—in contrast to the rigid system adopted at The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907—but must also apply the Convention to the ally if the latter accepts and applies the Convention (and the relevant Protocol or Protocols) and notifies the depositary State of this fact. It will be noted, however, that the formality of notifying the depositary is not required in the Geneva Conventions.

Concerning wars of liberation (in the sense of Art. 1, para. 4, of Protocol I of 1977), the authority representing a liberation movement may undertake to apply this new Convention and the associated Protocols with respect to a State which is party to these instruments and likewise bound by the 1977 Protocol I. The Convention and its Protocol or Protocols then become applicable between that State and the liberation movement, as does the 1977 Protocol I.

But the real innovation lies in the fact that the authority representing a liberation movement may act in the same way toward a State party to

the present Convention and to two or more of its Protocols, even if the movement is not bound by the 1977 Protocol I. Moreover, such commitment will result in the application, not only of the present Convention and its Protocols, but also of the Geneva Conventions as a whole. This means that the present Convention provides access to the whole body of the Geneva Conventions, something which was not envisaged by the Conventions.

The provision making this access possible calls for four comments.

1. It demonstrates clearly that recognition of the international character of wars of liberation, in the sense of Article 1, paragraph 4, of Protocol I of 1977, is not linked in international humanitarian law to this Protocol alone. The international character of such wars, already affirmed by numerous Resolutions of the UN General Assembly,¹ here obtains additional confirmation and, above all, direct involvement in the applicability of the Geneva Conventions.

2. Logically, the hypothesis presented by this provision should not occur. It would seem inconsistent for a State to agree to the present Convention without also accepting the 1977 Protocol I, which reaffirms or develops the principles applied in this Convention and its Protocols. But the possibility cannot be excluded, since refusal to accede to the 1977 Protocol I might be due to provisions unrelated to the question of weapons.

3. While this new step may be seen as encouraging the wider application of international humanitarian law in wars of liberation, it should be emphasized that the principle of equality of rights and obligations of the parties to a conflict—a vital element in international humanitarian law—has not been disputed: in fact it has been clearly reaffirmed.

4. The unlikely hypothesis of a State's becoming a party to the Convention without being a party to the Geneva Conventions was not even envisaged. This demonstrates the recognized universal character of those Conventions and should encourage the few States not yet officially bound by them to accede to them without delay.

The procedure for revising the Convention was one of the crucial points in the negotiations. Agreement was finally reached on an *ad hoc* system although the opinion was also expressed that the matter should be entrusted to the Disarmament Committee. A conference is to be convened at the request of the majority of the States parties to the

¹ In particular, Resolutions 2105 (XX), 2621 (XXV) and 3103 (XXVIII).

Convention (but at least eighteen States, as some felt it to be unacceptable for only eleven States to possess such powers).

Revision of the Convention and its Protocols is to be decided solely by the States which are parties to them, while the addition of further Protocols may be decided by all those States attending such a Conference. Though there is no explicit mention of the fact, the Conference would probably reach its decisions by consensus, as did the Conference which produced the Convention, and this should make it impossible, even for revision of the existing instruments, for decisions to be made on the basis of a majority of the moment.

A Conference will probably be held at least once every ten years, since, if a period of this duration has elapsed without a Conference, a request from only one of the High Contracting Parties is sufficient for the depositary to be obliged to convene a Conference.

Establishment of this procedure was imperative, as it gives lasting value to the Convention by leaving the door open for the introduction of other restrictions and by urging all States to practise constant vigilance to ensure that conventional weapons conform with the principles laid down in the Protocol I of 1977. The revision method also represents a valuable addition to Article 36 of Protocol I, which binds all Contracting Parties to examine all new weapons to make sure their use is not prohibited by international law.

2. The Protocols

a) *Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I)*

This Protocol has little immediate importance, since the weapons concerned have not been used—or in any case not widely—up to now. But it constitutes a ban for the future and should prevent undesirable developments. The prohibition is an expression of the principle that the purpose of a weapon should not be to hinder the healing of wounds it causes, and this principle is certainly one of the basic elements for determining whether a weapon produces “unnecessary suffering”.

b) *Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II)*

The purpose of Protocol II is to prevent or at any rate to reduce as far as possible loss and damage to civilians by the devices it covers, during hostilities and afterward, when those devices no longer have any military usefulness. The Protocol deals with a very definite problem: even today, many civilians are still being injured by mines, long after the events which led to the sowing of the minefield.

The Protocol does not tackle the awkward problem of mines laid during war at sea, a problem still covered by Conventions adopted at the beginning of the century. It might be thought, incidentally, that it is high time to consider updating international humanitarian law applicable to armed conflicts at sea.

In Article 3, Protocol II applies to the devices with which it is concerned the general principles which prohibit attacks on civilians and their property and indiscriminate attacks. This means that the use of certain booby-traps specially designed to attract civilians, or even children, is totally prohibited (see Article 6), while restrictions are laid on the use of mines, booby-traps and "other devices" defined in Article 2 (cf. Art. 4 and 5). A distinction is made between devices put in place from nearby and those delivered from a distance, i.e., "delivered by artillery, rocket, mortar or similar means or dropped from an aircraft". Those dropped from the air, especially, are very difficult to neutralize when they have ceased to fulfil their military function. The problem was solved by requiring either that they be supplied with a mechanism which makes them inactive after a certain lapse of time or that they be launched or dropped with sufficient precision for their positions to be recorded with accuracy. However, there was no agreement on more precise rules which might have determined, in particular, the height from which it was admissible for an aircraft to drop such mines.

Another aspect of this Protocol which should be stressed is the "international co-operation in the removal of minefields, mines and booby-traps" (Article 9). It is essential, if civilians are to be properly protected, for the parties to the conflict to collaborate, once active hostilities are over, by at least providing information concerning the mines they have laid. The text adopted does not go as far as was initially envisaged. In particular, it does not include the obligation to hand over, immediately after the cessation of active hostilities, charts showing the location of mines, even, to an occupying Power. Such an obligation was intended solely to give adequate protection for the civilian population, including those within occupied territory. Some delegations, however, found it impossible to envisage any co-operation whatever with an occupying force, even for humanitarian purposes.

Several of the rules in this long Protocol are consequently not very rigorous. For example, we may note that Article 3, paragraph 4, requests the parties to take "all feasible precautions" to protect civilians, that is, "those precautions which are practicable or practically possible taking into account all circumstances ruling at the time, including humanitarian and military considerations"; that advance warning is obligatory

before remotely-delivered mines are launched or dropped "unless circumstances do not permit" (Article 5 (2)); that the parties "shall endeavour to ensure" the recording of the location of minefields which were not pre-planned (Article 7 (2)).

The indecisive and complex character of the rules finally adopted indicates how acute were the problems encountered. Mines undeniably play an important part in military activities, but their indiscriminate use gives rise to inadmissible loss and damage to civilians. Protocol II is a typical offspring of the arranged marriage between military necessity and humanitarian imperatives, a union which has produced the whole of international humanitarian law. The legal protection of civilians against the effects of mines, booby-traps and other devices is far from perfect, but it is definitely better than it was.

c) *Protocol on the prohibitions or restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons (Protocol III)*

Incendiary weapons are probably the conventional weapons which have the greatest impact on public opinion. Many felt that any agreement on conventional weapons which did not include a Protocol on incendiary weapons would have the distressing appearance of a fire-brigade which had forgotten to bring the hose-pipe. If nothing had been achieved on this subject, it is likely that all the work of the Conference would have been wasted. This is a further reason to welcome the agreement finally obtained, during the last few days of the Conference, on this category of weapons.

Protocol III applies to incendiary weapons the general principle, reaffirmed in the 1977 Protocol I, that civilians should not be subject to attack. But it takes a big step further by placing severe restrictions on attacks on military objectives located within a concentration of civilians and particularly by prohibiting completely any attacks by air on such objectives. This provision is intended to prevent the terrible danger of huge concentrations of civilians being wiped out by fire.

Forests and plant cover are civilian property unless used for military purposes, and their protection is therefore included in the general rule prohibiting attacks on civilian property. Nevertheless, it was considered desirable to give prominence to this protection by mentioning it specifically, in view of the potentially disastrous nature of forest fires.

It will be noted that there is no provision to protect combatants against incendiary weapons. This is because emphasis was placed on the indiscriminate nature of these weapons and on the danger they present for civilians, rather than on their cruelty, an aspect which would have justified restriction of their use against combatants also.

Of course it may be argued that combatants are generally better equipped and can therefore deal more efficiently with the use of incendiary weapons. But among combatants too there have been extremely cruel burns, and several delegates regretted that no agreement could be reached after all on protecting combatants. A resolution on the subject was drafted by the Conference and sent to the UN General Assembly. This text "invites all governments to continue the consideration of the question of protection of combatants against incendiary weapons with a view to taking up the matter at the conference that may be convened in accordance with the provisions of Article 3 of the Convention adopted."

3. Resolution on Small-Calibre Weapon Systems

The Conference did not produce a Protocol on small-calibre projectiles which tumble upon impact and transfer considerable energy into the victim's body, thus causing extremely cruel wounds. But at its first session it adopted a resolution inviting governments to carry out further research and appealing to all governments "to exercise the utmost care in the development of small-calibre weapon systems, so as to avoid an unnecessary escalation of the injurious effects of such systems".

One of the major working documents distributed at the Conference emphasizes that research at present is being carried on in two directions: one, to find a medium capable of being used to simulate living tissue, the other, to evolve a simple test to determine the energy-transfer characteristics of a projectile.

V. SCOPE

The attempt to place the Convention of 10 October 1980 and its three Protocols in their context indirectly raises the question of their scope.

Obviously, the Convention, like the rest of international humanitarian law, does not claim to resolve any political problems. At most it could be argued that the moderation which it introduces into conflict is a factor favouring settlement.

The significance of a Convention of this kind, therefore, is purely humanitarian. Its relation is solely to men, women and children who would otherwise have been blown to pieces by mines, had their faces mutilated by booby-traps or their bodies burned by napalm. Those

who have been saved from these weapons will remain unknown, unlike those who, in spite of all efforts, will become victims. It is a peculiarity of such prohibitions that their merit is truly known through being breached.

Yet the potential victims who are spared because of the new law do exist. This is the firm belief and sole guiding motive of those who work for the development of international humanitarian law.

The link between the instruments adopted on 10 October 1980 and Protocol I of 8 June 1977 additional to the Geneva Conventions has not been settled categorically. It seems logical, however, to consider these restrictions and prohibitions as rules intended to put into concrete terms some of the principles laid down in the 1977 Protocol I, particularly in its Articles 35 and 51. Moreover, several points of the Convention's preamble give a clear indication in this direction. Yet it cannot be claimed that the prohibitions follow so naturally from the principles reaffirmed by the 1977 Protocol that an obligation concerning them existed before they were explicitly formulated. The protracted negotiations which were necessary to achieve these instruments plainly demonstrate that their content was by no means an obvious matter. So the Convention and its Protocols should be considered as a development of law and any condemnation of action taken previous to their enactment, by retroactive application of their underlying philosophy, would be, juridically, as sterile as it would be inadmissible.

We have already noted the conditions necessary for the Convention and its Protocols to be formally applicable. In particular, we have seen that they are to be applied only in international conflicts. Nonetheless, it seems undeniable that texts of this kind also carry great weight outside their official legal context.

The method of consensus, used very frequently in international conferences nowadays, undoubtedly confers a certain weight, in international circles, on the agreements reached at such conferences. The Vienna Convention on treaty law, very often cited well before it came into force, is a good example of this. But such a situation is true even more of humanitarian instruments. If States are agreed on the specially cruel character of certain weapons or certain combat methods and on the necessity of prohibiting them, can they decently fail to take such agreement into account even before they are legally bound to do so? In this connection, it is interesting to note that a draft resolution which the Conference sent to the UN General Assembly "calls upon all States which are not bound by the present Convention and which are engaged in an armed conflict, to notify the Secretary-General of the United

Nations that they will apply the Convention and one or more of the annexed Protocols in relation to that conflict, with respect to any other party to the conflict which accepts and abides by the same obligations.

But although the Convention is applicable in principle only in international armed conflicts, it is improbable that governments will feel free to use against their own population, in conflicts not of an international nature or in internal unrest, weapons and combat methods which they have agreed to forgo against an alien enemy.

In international humanitarian law, more than in any other sphere, public opinion would demur at any recourse to purely legal arguments for refusing to observe principles whose value had been widely acknowledged. An interesting fact reported by various technical experts is that the discussions and trials carried on by experts in relation to small-calibre weapon systems, although they have not yet resulted in binding prohibitions or restrictions, have nevertheless had a beneficial influence on several States when renewing their stock of weapons of this kind. (See also the resolution on the subject adopted by the Conference, the text of which is given below.)

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The adoption on 10 October 1980 of a Convention and three Protocols marks the completion of a significant phase in the evolution of international humanitarian law, a phase whose prime purpose has been to provide better legal protection for the civilian population against the effects of hostilities. In order to accomplish this, it was felt essential to reintroduce into international humanitarian law, without ambiguity, principles concerning the conduct of hostilities which had been laid down at the beginning of this century, at The Hague Conferences in 1899 and 1907, and to develop those principles. This was done in the 1977 Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions. But the principles alone, without precise rules to buttress them, were in danger of remaining mere words, and the merit of the Convention of 10 October 1980 and its three Protocols is that they have tackled the problem directly and specifically. In this sense, the instruments are valuable, or rather indispensable, supplements to the 1977 Protocols.

While the reaffirmation in international humanitarian law of principles concerning the conduct of hostilities was intended chiefly to give better protection for the civilian population, it must be acknowledged that these principles were originally formulated, above all, to alleviate

the suffering of combatants. Simplifying the matter, it may be said that methods or means of combat having indiscriminate effects are prohibited because there is too great a risk of their harming the civilian population, while the ban or restriction on excessively cruel weapons takes into account combatants as well as civilians. Mines may be placed in the first category, non-detectable fragments in the second. Even so, there are weapons, such as incendiary weapons, which may be classified, depending on which aspect is considered, in one or other of these categories. The restrictions placed on the use of these weapons in Protocol III are motivated by the indiscriminate character of such weapons and the risk that they may injure civilians. Yet the reason that several delegations expressed the wish to continue work on the subject was that they considered these weapons—or some of their uses, at any rate—to be excessively cruel and for this reason wanted combatants also to be granted protection.

We have seen that some international value must undeniably be attributed to the instruments which have just been adopted, regardless of when they enter into force. Yet it is plain that formal accession to such instruments gives them much more weight and that lack of interest by the States might well lead to their being forgotten. It is to be earnestly hoped that the States will sign and then ratify these instruments rapidly and in very large numbers. Incidentally, many States refused to ratify the 1977 Protocols until or unless they were supplemented by an instrument concerning weapons. For those States, as for the great majority of others, the adoption of the Convention of 10 October 1980 and its Protocols should be the occasion of acceding to the whole of the corpus of modern international humanitarian law. The phase just completed was essential to maintain the credibility of this law. The States which have patiently worked together to produce the Convention should now, by acceding to it, indicate their determination to respect its humanitarian principles and rules.

The texts adopted in 1980, like those of 1977, indicate that the world is horrified by the massacre and mutilation of millions of civilians during the conflicts of our century. These texts are the result of patient effort and we should welcome their adoption. But progress made in international humanitarian law is never completely satisfactory: there is always the question whether it could not have been taken a step further, whether more lives could have been saved, more suffering avoided. Alongside the advances made, however substantial, there is the shadow of those which have perhaps failed to come into being for lack of perseverance or persuasion.

The mixed feelings which greet any advance in international humanitarian law, however, are due to deeper causes, to be found in the nature of that law, able only to relieve and not eliminate the absurd suffering engendered by armed conflicts. In our time, as never before, the necessity of attacking the causes of evil and not merely its effects is obvious to everyone. The extent of the probable consequences of any large-scale conflict makes any efforts to attenuate them appear derisory. Those engaged in such efforts, therefore, even though convinced of the nobility of their task, must regard it as a contribution to peace and an urgent appeal to those capable of achieving it.

Yves Sandoz

Assistant Director

Department of Principles and Law, ICRC

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

President of ICRC and Executive Board re-elected

At its session of 17-18 December 1980, the Assembly of the International Committee of the Red Cross re-elected Mr. Alexandre Hay to the Presidency of the ICRC for a period of four years.

Mr. Hay had succeeded Professor Eric Martin as ICRC President and had taken up his duties on July 1, 1976. He will continue, as ICRC President, to chair the Executive Board.

The ICRC Assembly also re-elected Mr. Richard Pestalozzi, Mr. Jakob Burckhardt, Mr. Athos Gallino and Mr. Rudolf Jäckli to membership of the Executive Board and accepted the resignation of Mrs. Denise Bindschedler-Robert, to whom it expressed its warmest thanks for her distinguished services since the Executive Board was set up in 1973.

Mrs. Bindschedler-Robert remains a member of the Assembly.

The Assembly elected Mrs. Andrée Weitzel, who became a member of the ICRC in 1979, to take Mrs. Bindschedler-Robert's place on the Executive Board.

Ratification of the Protocols

The Swiss Government has received two instruments signifying the ratification by the Lao People's Democratic Republic of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I) and of Non-international Armed Conflicts (Protocol II), adopted in Geneva on 8 June 1977.

The instruments were registered by the Swiss Government on 18 November 1980. The Protocols, in accordance with their provisions, will enter into force for the Lao People's Democratic Republic six months after the instruments of ratification have been deposited, namely on 18 May 1981.

This ratification brings to seventeen the number of States parties to Protocol I, and sixteen to Protocol II.

Declarations of accession and of succession to the Protocol for the Prohibition of Asphyxiating Gases

The Government of the French Republic, which is the depositary of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, has received from the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, their instruments of accession to the Protocol, and from the Government of Papua New Guinea the notification of succession to the same Protocol.

The Protocol states that accessions shall be notified to the Government of the French Republic, and by the latter to all signatory and acceding Powers, and shall take effect on the date of notification by the Government of the French Republic.

Accordingly, the Protocol entered into force on 15 December 1980 for the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, on 17 December 1980 for the Democratic Republic of Sudan, and on 18 December 1980 for Papua New Guinea.

Declaration of intent by the African National Congress

On 28 November 1980, Mr. O. R. Tambo, President of the African National Congress, handed to the President of the ICRC the following declaration, signed by himself:

« ... The African National Congress of South Africa hereby declares that... it intends to respect and be guided by the general principles of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts.

Wherever practically possible, the African National Congress of South Africa will endeavour to respect the rules of the four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the victims of armed conflicts and the 1977 additional Protocol I relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts. »

ICRC radiocommunications in 1980

Emergency radiocommunications in the Red Cross, whenever a natural disaster or an armed conflict takes place, are of great importance and within the last few years the Red Cross independent radio network has been considerably extended.

In 1979, the World Administrative Radio Conference, recognizing that this radiocommunication system filled a need, adopted two important resolutions which were greeted by the Red Cross with great satisfaction.¹

Readers may be interested to have some statistics on Red Cross radiocommunication traffic.

In 1980 there were 7,454 radio messages exchanged between the ICRC's Geneva headquarters and its delegations in the field, corresponding to about 638,000 words.

Expressed as a percentage, 57 per cent of the messages were exchanged with delegations in Africa, 27.5 per cent with those in the Middle East, and 15.5 per cent with those in Latin America.

The ICRC delegations exchanged with each other 20,544 radio messages, or 829,000 words.

In addition, 34,000 messages were sent or received by telex or by telegram. Thus, in 1980 the total number of messages was about 62,000, or 40 per cent more than in 1979.

¹ See *International Review of the Red Cross*, March-April 1979 and March-April 1980.

EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES

Africa

Mission of the delegate general

Between 18 November and 12 December, Mr. Frank Schmidt, ICRC delegate general for Africa, carried out a mission which took him successively to Uganda, Ethiopia and the Sudan.

In Kampala, where he stayed from 20 to 27 November, Mr. Schmidt held discussions with representatives of the authorities, notably Mr. Paulo Muwanga, chairman of the military committee. He also met Mr. Milton Obote who subsequently became President of the Republic, following the elections on 10 December.

At Addis Ababa, from 29 November to 6 December, the delegate general had discussions with several members of the government, including the Minister of Health and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and with representatives of the National Red Cross Society.

Finally, from 7 to 12 December, Mr. Schmidt stayed in Khartoum (see below under "Sudan").

Namibia / South West Africa

From 19 November to 8 December, having received the necessary authorizations, ICRC delegates visited three condemned prisoners and four people detained under Proclamation AG 26.

These visits were conducted in accordance with the usual ICRC criteria.

The prisoners visited were, moreover, given permission to correspond with their families through the ICRC.

On 28 November, Mr. O. R. Tambo, President of the African National Congress (ANC), delivered a statement to the President of the ICRC in which his movement pledged to respect the principles of international

humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts, in its struggle in South Africa. The text of the statement is given elsewhere in the *Review*.

Angola

During November and December, danger and logistic difficulties somewhat hampered the medical aid and relief operations of the ICRC in Angola. In November, distributions of food, soap, blankets and clothes in aid of some 40,000 displaced persons in the northern zone (Bailundo) and the eastern zone (Katchiungo) totalled approximately 130 tons. In December, operations in the field were suspended, conditions being deemed too hazardous. Nevertheless, on 4 and 5 December, delegates provided the special feeding centre at Katchiungo with supplies for a month and delivered 6 tons of semolina in aid of 750 displaced persons; at Alto Chiumbo and at Kaialula, they organized a general distribution of food for a month.

The activity of the ICRC medical team was particularly focused on training local staff who work in the six health stations set up by the ICRC to provide first aid to the inhabitants of about fifteen villages. An anti-scabies campaign was started in the orphanage of Bailundo (280 children). In the same locality, bandages and dressings were delivered to the State hospital and to the Protestant Mission hospital. In addition, the medical team conducted surveys at Trappa, Sachipangela and Valodia and closely followed progress at the special feeding centre of Katchiungo.

The orthopedic centre for amputees at Bomba Alta fitted ten more patients with artificial limbs in November.

With a view to the programme in Angola for the first six months of 1981 an on-the-spot survey was carried out from 19 to 30 November by Mr. Philippe Dind, head of the ICRC Relief Division.

Zimbabwe

A new air-lift was organized to transport relief supplies from Zimbabwe to Angola. In the course of three flights on 10, 23 and 25 November, 35 tons of food, 10 tons of soap, rolls of plastic sheeting, medicines, various material and stores and three cross-country vehicles were delivered to Huambo.

Ethiopia

From the beginning of November to 8 December, the ICRC delegation at Addis Ababa supplied the Ethiopian Red Cross with 140 tons

of food, 12 tons of dried milk, 40 bales of blankets and 12 bales of cotton material, representing a total value of 260,000 Swiss francs, for distribution in the administrative provinces of Gondar, Harar, Bale, Sidamo, Tigre and Eritrea. Various medical stores were also delivered to supply the dispensaries in the region of Asmara.

Since its foundation in January 1979 and up to the end of November 1980, the rehabilitation centre for the war disabled, set up by the ICRC at Debra Zeit, has produced 513 pairs of crutches, 601 artificial limbs and 53 wheel-chairs. Eight specialists from the ICRC, assisted by fifty-five employees recruited locally work in this centre.

Sudan

From 7 to 12 December, a delegation from the ICRC took part in the XXIInd Conference of the Arab Red Crescent and Red Cross Societies, organized by the Sudanese Red Crescent. The delegation was led by Mr. Jacques Moreillon, director of the department of Principles and Law at the ICRC, and included Mr. Frank Schmidt, delegate general, and Mr. Jean-Marc Bornet, regional delegate.

Somalia

From 7 to 18 December, Mr. Hans-Peter Gasser, head of the legal division, and Mr. Francis Amar, assistant to the director of the Department of Operations, were in the Somali Democratic Republic at the invitation of the authorities. Received by the leaders of the National Red Crescent, they had several discussions with the Minister of Defence and Vice-President of the Republic, the Minister for Local Governments and Rural Development, the Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office, the Commander-in-Chief of the Prison Service and other government officials. Problems inherent in the aid and welfare mission of the ICRC were raised during these conversations.

On the 14 December, the two ICRC delegates visited, for the second time, a Cuban prisoner of war (already visited by the ICRC in May 1979) and obtained permission to visit the Ethiopian prisoners of war captured following the fighting in the Ogaden, on behalf of whom numerous applications have been made by the ICRC since 1977. As a result, 197 prisoners were seen on 14 December and seven others on the 15 December in the outskirts of the capital. During these visits, capture cards were filled out and family messages written by the prisoners.

From 9 to 12 December, Mr. Gasser and Mr. Amar made a tour of the region bordering Ethiopia (in the North-Eastern Province)

accompanied by members of the Red Crescent and by a representative of the Ministry of Defence, with a view to organizing aid for civilian victims of the fighting.

Uganda

Following a survey in the districts of Arua and Moyo, from 10 to 13 November by the head of the ICRC delegation at Kampala, an emergency programme was initiated in aid of the civilian victims of armed combats which had broken out at the beginning of October in the West Nile province in north-western Uganda. The first truck loaded with 10 tons of relief supplies (food, medicines, blankets, kitchen utensils, soap) was sent to Moyo on 17 November. It was followed on 27 November by a second consignment of 8.5 tons of food (maize, dried milk, oil), a gift from the World Food Programme and from "CARE-Uganda".

The beneficiaries of the aid were principally civilians taking refuge in and around the missions. Four centres for distributing milk to children and women in labour were set up at Arua and Nebbi. In addition, hospitals and dispensaries were supplied with medicines. Four batches of medicines and two of dressings were dispatched to the hospital at Moyo on 20 December.

Moreover, within the context of its traditional activities, the ICRC carried on with its visits to detention centres in Uganda. From 19 to 21 November, a delegate and a nurse went to the prisons of Jinja, Luzira and Murchison Bay where they delivered various relief supplies, including 1.6 tons of dried milk, food, medicines, soap and recreational items. Relief supplies of the same kind were distributed in the prisons of Mbale and Soroti between 25 and 28 November. A special visit was made to sick prisoners and a programme started to fit disabled prisoners with artificial limbs.

In October and November, the Tracing Agency in Kampala opened 58 new inquiries and transmitted 3,033 family messages.

Chad

As reported in the previous issue of the *International Review*, the ICRC was compelled to suspend its activities in Chad at the beginning of October, and to recall its delegates to Geneva, because conditions had become too dangerous to continue working there.

In mid-December, following the fall of N'Djamena to the armed forces of the Government of the National Union of Transition (GUNT),

the ICRC was invited by the GUNT president to resume its operations in Chad. As a result, five delegates including a specialist from the Central Tracing Agency and two nurses arrived in N'Djamena on 21 December, to bring emergency aid to the civilian and military victims of the fighting. There they joined Dr. Charles Jeanmaire, former ICRC delegate in Chad, who was engaged in looking after the refugees from Chad at Kousseri, under the programme of the League of Red Cross Societies.

The first task of the delegates was to conduct a tour of the hospitals of N'Djamena and the outskirts of Farcha where they delivered 300 kilos of medical relief supplies (basic medicines and dressings). Contacts were also made with the authorities with a view to resuming protection operations and the activities of the Tracing Agency.

Latin America

Mission of the delegate general

Mr. André Pasquier, ICRC delegate general for Latin America, carried out a mission in Argentina and Chile from 3 to 17 December.

In Argentina, where he stayed until 10 December, the delegate general met Colonel Cerda, Legal and Technical Under-Secretary to the Presidency, and senior officials of the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice, with whom he reviewed the ICRC protective activities in the country.

In Chile, Mr. Pasquier took part in the visit to the Santiago prison and had discussions with the president of the National Red Cross Society.

Argentina

The last series of visits to detention centres in Argentina for 1980 finished on 15 December. During the last three months of the year, the delegates of the ICRC visited the prisons of Caseros and La Plata, where they saw, respectively, 214 and 673 detainees, and four other detention centres with a total of 91 detainees. In addition, a medical delegate visited three detainees in the hospital at Borda.

Bolivia

The protection and aid programme of the ICRC in Bolivia for the benefit of political detainees and their families came to an end on 18

December with the departure from La Paz of the last remaining delegates. Begun shortly after the change of regime on 17 July 1980, this programme was completed by the end of November with the release, expulsion from the country or placing under house arrest of people who had been detained on account of the events.

From 2 August to 4 December, ICRC delegates made 84 visits to 18 places of detention in Bolivia: 9 in La Paz and 9 in the provinces, including four in the tropical region of the country. During that period, the number of detainees visited totalled 664, including 36 women. Some of the detainees were visited several times.

The relief supplies delivered to the detainees (food, straw mattresses, blankets, clothes, kitchen utensils, recreational items), and the financial aid provided to the most needy of the prisoners' families, represented a value of approximately 22,000 dollars.

Chile

Mr. François Robadey, ICRC regional delegate for the countries of the Southern Cone, based in Buenos Aires, started a new series of visits to detention centres in Chile. From 27 November to 14 December, he visited four centres where he saw a total of 78 detainees. During a visit to the "Penitenciaria" in Santiago, in which the delegate general for Latin America took part, 620 kilos of food was delivered to the detainees.

Ecuador

While in Ecuador from 13 to 16 November, Mr. Armin Kobel, ICRC regional delegate for the Andean countries, took part in the first Symposium for the propagation of international humanitarian law, meeting at Machala, where he conducted two debates on the activities of the ICRC in Latin America.

Nicaragua

During the last two months of 1980, the delegates of the ICRC twice visited the two large detention centres at Managua: the "Centro de readaptación social Jorge Navarro" (ex Carcel Modelo) and the "Centro de readaptación social héroes y mártires de Nueva Guinea" (formerly Zona Franca). During the first visit they saw 2,355 detainees in the first centre and 1,870 in the second.

In the provinces, the delegates visited Chinandega (where they saw respectively 518 and 400 detainees in two detention centres), Granada

(also with two centres holding respectively 73 and 266 detainees), Jinotepc (245 detainees) and Masaya (602 detainees).

At the same time the ICRC approached the authorities with a view to extending its protection to all the detainees in Nicaragua. To this end, it requested access to places under the control of State Security, as it had been visiting only places within the jurisdiction of the national prison system.

During the second half of 1980, 293 tons of food, representing a value of 258,000 dollars, was distributed to prisons.

In order to be able to carry on its protection and aid programmes in Nicaragua during 1981, the ICRC appealed at the beginning of December to certain governments and National Red Cross Societies for 2.5 million Swiss francs.

El Salvador

During the last months of 1980, the renewed outbreak of violence in El Salvador prompted the ICRC to devote particular attention to the condition of several tens of thousands of displaced persons—mainly women, children and old people—in various parts of the country, especially in Chalatenango, Cabanas, San Vicente, Morazán and San Miguel.

Acting in co-operation with the Salvadorean Red Cross, the ICRC had drawn up a plan, as early as the month of October, for emergency aid to some 45,000 civilians in the fighting areas that were difficult to reach. First and foremost, the Red Cross programme aimed to supply food and medical supplies, as well as clothes and kitchen utensils.

Started at the beginning of November, aid to these victims of events steadily increased, insofar as security conditions permitted the relief convoys to arrive on site and the delegates of the Red Cross to carry out distributions. By the end of December, over 20 tons of food had been distributed in aid of 3,500 people in the regions to the north and centre of the country and 93 tons in the region of San Miguel where 42,000 displaced persons had been recorded in a census taken on 1 November—a figure that had fallen to 23,000 by 20 December.

Following an assessment of the structure and resources of the principal hospitals in the country, the ICRC, in conjunction with the National Society, drew up a programme for the collection of blood in order to establish emergency stocks to supply hospitals. A medical delegate left Geneva for San Salvador in January 1981 for the purpose of setting up this blood collection centre and supervising its organization.

To provide protection, the ICRC delegates made 267 visits to detention centres in San Salvador and the provinces between 15 June and 23 December 1980, gaining access to a total of 537 prisoners. Some of these were visited several times.

During the last five months of the year, the Tracing Agency at San Salvador received some 700 requests for inquiry into missing persons. Nearly 160 cases were solved, including about 50 people located by the ICRC delegates during their visits to places of detention.

Asia

Mission by a member of the Committee to Thailand and Cambodia

Dr. Athos Gallino, a member of the Committee, carried out a mission in Thailand and Cambodia from 17 to 24 November. He was accompanied by Dr. Rémi Russbach, chief medical officer, and Mr. René Kosirnik, delegate in charge of the Cambodia-Thailand action at ICRC headquarters in Geneva.

During his stay in Thailand, Dr. Gallino travelled the length of the Khmer-Thai frontier visiting medical centres in which treatment is dispensed to Cambodian national under the medical aid programme of the ICRC. He also went to the camp at Prasat Sarokot (NW9), where refugees of Vietnamese origin are housed.

In Kampuchea, Dr. Gallino visited three of the five hospitals functioning with ICRC assistance, in Kompong Speu, Takhmau and Svay Rieng, where are working the medical teams provided by the National Red Cross Societies of Hungary, the USSR and Sweden, respectively.

Assistance to Kampuchean people

Financing of the relief operation for the Khmer population in Thailand and Kampuchea was discussed at two meetings held by donor countries on 19 November and 10 December in New York, under the aegis of the United Nations. During the second meeting, thirteen States and governmental organizations announced contributions totalling 63.6 million dollars. Eleven others promised contributions of sums as yet unspecified. The budget presented by the organizations engaged in humanitarian operations in aid of the populations of Kampuchea (ICRC, UNICEF, HCR, FAO, WFP) amounts to approximately 200 million dollars for 1981.

Mr. Jean-Pierre Hocké, director of the Operations Department, represented the ICRC at these two meetings and on the same occasion he had talks with leading officials of the United Nations and representatives of several donor countries.

On 31 December 1980, UNICEF and the ICRC ended their joint participation in the humanitarian assistance programme to the Khmer population, while continuing to collaborate closely. In 1981 the ICRC will concentrate on its traditional activities. In Kampuchea, for instance, it will continue to provide medical assistance and will try to extend its tracing and protection functions. In Thailand it will pursue its medical activities and its duties of protection and seeking missing persons. The Bangkok delegation will remain the logistic base for the action as a whole.

Kampuchea

It was a year ago, on 19 January 1980, that the ICRC medical action began in Kampuchea, with the arrival of the first medical team provided by National Societies, which was sent by the Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR. This group was followed by four others, from the Red Cross Societies of Hungary, Poland, the German Democratic Republic and Sweden. In twelve months these doctors and technicians have made it possible for the ICRC, working with other organizations, to repair, re-equip and restock five hospitals in four provinces of Kampuchea.

Over the same period the ICRC was engaged in reactivating the medical infrastructure in Kampuchea, by organizing the distribution, in village and district dispensaries, of about 500 "units" of assorted basic medicines and paramedical material to a value of 600,000 dollars.

In a mission to Kampuchea from 20 November to 1 December 1980, Dr. Rémi Russbach visited the five hospitals where the ICRC teams were working. He was thus able to evaluate the medical work performed during the emergency period of the action and to draw up the general outline of the assistance programme for the first few months of 1981. Before leaving Phnom Penh, Dr. Russbach had an interview with the Minister of Health, Mr. Nu Beng.

Relief supplies have been ferried in by the ICRC aircraft shuttling between Bangkok and Phnom Penh: it made 40 flights between 4 November and 31 December, transporting 493 tons of supplies to a value of 1,058,000 dollars. A further 139 tons of relief goods were taken into Kampuchea during the same period for other organizations, particularly the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (HCR).

Thailand

Several surveys having led to the conclusion that the situation no longer required emergency action, the ICRC suspended its participation in the programme of food relief on the Khmer-Thai frontier on 16 December. The last distributions at the two "land bridges" of Ban Kalor and Nong Chan were made on the 8-9 and 15-16 December: on these occasions rations of rice were handed out to a total of 24,588 persons, 4,560 of whom arrived at the two distribution points in ox-drawn carts. From 1 November to mid-December, the relief distributed at the "land bridges" totalled more than 4,600 tons, representing about 1,690,000 dollars. Also during this period, some 84 tons of food and various relief supplies (approximate value 40,000 dollars) were handed over by the ICRC to about 3,000 refugees of Vietnamese origin living in Camp NW9.

The medical activity included a vaccination campaign in the north of Aranyaprathet for roughly 1150 children ranging in age from 3 months to 12 years. The anti-malaria programme was successful, resulting in a considerable drop in the number of deaths in the camps. The ICRC medical teams continued the transfer of sick persons from the frontier to hospitals in the holding centres. Finally, the four centres for traditional medicine, set up by the ICRC at Khao-I-Dang, Sakeo and Kamput, treated an average of 1,700 patients a day. In November and December, the ICRC's medical and paramedical assistance on the Khmer-Thai frontier amounted to 198,200 dollars.

The tracing agency in Bangkok, the staff of which at the end of December numbered ten delegates and around one hundred people recruited locally, was kept very busy in the last two months of the year. In November alone, 815 new enquiries were begun and 113 completed. Also the agency sent out or received 120,289 letters and carried out some 500 transfers of persons.

Mr. Ulrich Wasser, director of the Central Tracing Agency in Geneva, visited Thailand from 1 to 6 December, in order to study on the spot the problems related to tracing activities, with an eye to the 1981 action programme.

Indonesia

On 26 November, under the programme for reuniting families between East Timor and Portugal, the ICRC organized the transfer of two persons, an adult who was sick and a child. Six children from

East Timor had previously been flown to their parents in Lisbon, under the auspices of the ICRC, on 8 October.

Pakistan

In October and November, Dr. Pascal Grellety, ICRC medical co-ordinator, twice went to the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan to visit the ICRC mobile medical teams working in the camps of Afghan refugees in the Kurram and in North Waziristan. Another purpose of his missions was to study the possibility of improving the ICRC's medical aid, in particular by setting up and equipping permanent dispensaries in the principal camps.

On 30 November, the first two dispensaries, each to be run by two locally recruited nurses, one male, one female, and serving a population of about 40,000 refugees, were put into service in the camps at Tindu and Satin (in the Kurram). Similar permanent medical centres are to be established in other camps, such as that at Adisai, about thirty kilometres from Peshawar.

The ICRC also proposed to the Pakistan Government that a fourth medical team be installed in the Peshawar area. At the beginning of January 1981 the Pakistan authorities gave permission for the opening of two medical centres in Peshawar, one specializing in post-operative treatment and the other reserved for women and children.

It should also be mentioned that the ICRC provided aid in the form of parcels of dressings and of basic medicines to various organizations (e.g. "Médecins sans Frontières") helping victims of the conflict in Afghanistan.

Philippines

From 26 October to 23 November, three ICRC delegates, one of them a doctor, carried out a mission to the Philippines, with the intention of assessing the situation and the needs of the displaced civilians on Mindanao and Samar having fled the fighting between Government armed forces and opposition movements.

The ICRC is supporting the relief action of the Philippines Red Cross to help about 40,000 displaced persons. The Committee sent 1,000 tons of rice and 500 tons of milk powder donated by the European Economic Community (EEC); and gave 40,000 Swiss francs to the National Society for its medical assistance programme.

In its protective capacity, the ICRC continued its negotiations with the authorities in Manila to obtain permission to visit certain categories of detainees to whom it has not yet had access.

Viet Nam

Fourteen Taiwan fishermen whose boat had strayed into Vietnamese territorial waters and who had been detained in Viet Nam since May 1980 were freed and repatriated under ICRC auspices on 4 December.

Middle East

Iraq-Iran conflict

In November and December, the ICRC delegates continued their visits in Iraq and Iran to prisoners of war taken in the armed conflict opposing the two countries.

Following negotiations with the Iraqi authorities, based on the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, the ICRC was authorized to visit the territories occupied by the Iraqi armed forces in order to assess possible humanitarian needs. Between 9 and 22 December, the ICRC delegates visited the areas of Qasr-e-Shirin, Mehran, Khorramshahr and Shalamjeh, and were able to conclude that material assistance from the ICRC did not appear to be necessary at that stage. Nevertheless, it offered to set up tracing activities for separated families.

In Iran, two ICRC delegates went to Ahwaz on 13 January. They were received by Mr. Bani Sadr, President of the Republic, and General Fallahi, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Iranian forces. The delegates discussed with them problems in relation to the ICRC's protection activities.

In addition to their duties arising from the conflict between Iraq and Iran, the ICRC delegates in Teheran continued to visit political detainees. From 22 November to 1 December, a team composed of five delegates, one of them a doctor, visited 1,088 detainees, including 73 women, in the prison at Evin. In 1980, 3,235 detainees subject to the Islamic courts were seen by the ICRC delegates in eleven towns in Iran.

Israel and the occupied territories

Mr. Jean Hocfliger, ICRC delegate general for the Middle East, was in Tel-Aviv from 16 to 22 December. This mission enabled him to appraise ICRC activities in Israel and the occupied territories.

Visits to detainees were continued: between 31 October and 2 January 1981 the ICRC delegates made 172 visits to detainees under interrogation in the West Bank (129 of them for the first time), and made 244 other visits (130 for the first time) in the Gaza Strip.

In the same period, visits were made to the prisons of Kfar Yona, Nafha, Jenin, Neve Tirza, Ramleh, Beersheba, Ramallah and Gaza.

Transfers

On 24 November two Lebanese nationals who had been detained in Israel were transferred to Lebanon under ICRC auspices.

On the same day, two transfers between the occupied territory of Golan and Syria were organized by the ICRC to reunite a family in Syria and to repatriate a person who had been detained in Israel and had completed his sentence.

Two other transfers took place across the Allenby Bridge through the good offices of the ICRC: on 12 December a South Korean national who had strayed into Israel was taken back to Jordan; the same day the Jordan authorities handed over to the Israeli authorities a youth who had strayed into Jordanian territory.

Lebanon

Emergency medical supplies were sent by the ICRC delegates on 22 December to Zahlé, where the local branch of the Lebanese Red Cross was treating some 50 wounded persons, following fighting between troops of two opposing factions. The town was surrounded and cut off from the outside; nevertheless the delegates succeeded in evacuating an injured woman to the hospital and later took a sick man to Beirut. Two surveys were subsequently made in Zahlé; one sick person was transferred to Beirut on 26 December.

In the last quarter of 1980, the Beirut tracing agency opened 51 inquiries and completed eleven. In addition, it sent 1,371 family messages, carried out eight transfers of persons between various zones within Lebanon, and issued three travel documents.

Jordan

From 1 to 20 December, a team composed of three ICRC delegates made a fresh series of visits to seven places of detention in Jordan. During the visits, sports equipment and leisure items were handed to the detainees.

The ICRC delegation in Amman carries out two series of visits a year to all detainees in Jordan. The visits mentioned above were part of these series.

In addition, the delegation visits every three weeks all security detainees under interrogation.

All these visits are made according to usual ICRC procedures.

The ICRC delegation is the only means of rapid communication between dispersed families, some of whose members live in Jordan and others in the occupied territories. Each week the delegation sends and receives family messages written on Red Cross forms (about 8,700 such family messages were exchanged in 1980); it transmits urgent family messages by radio (8,450 radio messages were exchanged between Amman and Jerusalem in 1980).

Red Cross family messages are subject to strict rules: they may only contain personal or family news to the exclusion of any other matter (commercial, for example).

Arab Republic of Yemen

Mr. Jean-Marc Bornet, regional delegate for the Middle East and North Africa, carried out a mission in the Arab Republic of Yemen from 12 to 21 December. During his stay in Sanaa, Mr. Bornet had talks with representatives of the authorities and with the leaders of the "Red Crescent" of North Yemen. He also visited two places of detention

The Lebanese Red Cross today

After a period spent almost entirely in performing relief work, an activity which takes precedence over everything else during a civil war, the Lebanese Red Cross started, some three years ago, on a new phase of development, based on two main activities: stirring the population to awareness of the human problems peculiar to Lebanon, and secondly, teaching and training young people. At the same time, the Lebanese National Society naturally continued to carry out its medico-social activities, for the grave incidents which still take place in several parts of the country are but the natural consequences of the conflict which broke out in 1975 and which has not yet been brought to a conclusion.

The Red Cross branches in southern Lebanon have still to cope with a very unstable situation, in a climate of permanent insecurity and with sporadic outbreaks of fighting and border incidents occurring almost every day. Contact with the capital is very difficult and very often the only way to communicate is by sending special messengers by car, who have to brave the perils on the road.

In other parts of the country, clashes between armed bands are causing a whole series of ills: many persons wounded, villagers fleeing their homes, prisoners captured; all these people the Red Cross endeavours to succour.

But now that there have been fairly long periods of truce, and various plans and projects are well advanced, we would like to give here an account of what is being done.

The Red Cross Teaching Guide

The *Teaching Guide*, elaborated by the ICRC and the League, is an educational instrument which meets present teaching standards and is intended to arouse the interest of youth in humanitarian problems and in the principles of the Red Cross.

In Lebanon, the work of printing and circulating the *Teaching Guide* and introducing it into the official school curriculum was carried out by the Junior Section of the Red Cross. It was first necessary to translate this voluminous publication and also to add to it a special chapter on the National Society. The commission that was then set up undertook a series of high-level discussions and contacts, with the purpose of settling the various stages for the execution of the programme.

The departments concerned at the Ministry of National Education having given their full support to the project, the immediate result was that the Pedagogical Research Centre printed two thousand copies of an Arabic version of the *Teaching Guide*, intended for secondary school teachers, and agreed to adapt its forthcoming school textbooks for all the schools in Lebanon, so as to introduce in them the Red Cross notions as recommended in the *Teaching Guide*.

The daily press, radio and television gave accounts of the development of the project at regular intervals. It is expected that lectures will be given shortly at the University of Lebanon and at the "Ecole normale" (Teachers' Training Institute) to help teachers get better acquainted with these texts.

The aim is to allow teachers, through the normal school curriculum, to inculcate in their pupils a good knowledge of the Red Cross: its goals, its activities and above all its humanitarian principles.

It is in this fashion that the young will be nurtured on these notions from a tender age, a process that should contribute to combat any tendencies they otherwise might have had for violence and fanaticism, and should develop their sentiment of human solidarity.

Community health

A pilot-study on community health was developed by three qualified nurses in one of Lebanon's most underprivileged villages. The idea was to conduct a detailed survey among the villagers and from the results thus found set up a self-sufficient medical structure, based on the village's potential manpower, also taking into account its remoteness. It was planned that the financing and initial training of local personnel should be done by the official medical services of the region in co-operation with the Red Cross. The survey claimed more than a week of intensive work on the spot, under extremely difficult conditions, due to the village's remoteness and poverty. However, despite the urgent need for such a project, the implementation of the programme urged by its authors has not yet begun for various reasons, not the least important being the

political situation. The plans are ready and hopes are high that the project will be soon carried out.

Community development

A second project is now in full expansion. This is a pilot community development project carried out in a Red Cross dispensary opened in one of the poorer districts of the capital. After having made a study of the situation and of the various factors connected with the general surroundings, the member of the Lebanese Red Cross Central Committee in charge of the project, with the help of a team of voluntary workers and of a social welfare officer, set up a veritable community development centre. Here, the inhabitants of the district can meet in congenial surroundings and find many outlets for their activities. A variety of courses are offered, such as literacy lessons, first aid, sewing and even a course on social psychology.

The centre almost immediately attracted the inhabitants, especially the women, whose social evolution is still somewhat lagging behind, and who can find here suitable opportunities for broadening their activities in various forms well adapted to their surroundings.

This centre of attraction for the whole of the district is an appropriate place for launching a number of campaigns (cleanliness, vaccination, etc.) in which the active involvement of the population can be very useful.

The range of activities has grown to such a degree that it is not only the adults who receive training. The smaller children and in particular those in infants classes have now been included in the project, for the organizers have found that if one wished to introduce fundamental improvements in the community at various levels, the education of the very young was an indispensable step, without which nothing of any substance could be constructed. The children's teachers, together with the social welfare officers and voluntary workers, have therefore arranged for a series of talks to be given to the children on such themes as love for their country, and respect for their surroundings, their family, their home and the human person.

The logical course would be to open more centres throughout the country. But every quarter in the towns, every region in a country which has such a large variety of communities, must form the object of a special study, and the practical application will be in every case of a new and specific character.

The struggle against drugs

In its struggle against drugs, an evil which is causing today considerable problems among young people in Lebanon, the Red Cross has adopted a progressive method: surveys and studies, in co-operation with specialists; seminars to train social workers and various categories of educators and to familiarize them with preventive action; colour leaflets, showing strip cartoons, edited by the Junior Red Cross, widely distributed on university campuses and to many people interested in the scheme; compilation of a file on the role that could be played by young people in the prevention of drug addiction; publication of a special issue of the journal edited by the Pedagogical Research Centre on drugs and the drug problem.

Many people and all kinds of different bodies are taking part in this struggle: the association of doctors and pharmacists, magistrates, the police force, special anti-drug brigades, the legislative authorities, the mass media, schools, government ministries and various public and private organizations.

Basic health and first aid

Awareness, teaching and training: these are the three key-words for one of the main objectives of the Lebanese Red Cross for 1979 and 1980 in the sphere of basic health and first aid. Seminars have been organized by education directors and have been held in different parts of the country so that a great number of people might take advantage of these meetings. Their purpose is to train workers in basic health and first aid, who later can teach these two useful subjects to different groups in the country. The aim is to spread as widely as possible the rudiments of basic health and first aid among all sections of the population, beginning with the least developed groups in the community.

Some courses are given to quite illiterate people, mostly young women, which does not render the task any easier. In many cases, the literacy class is combined with the teaching of one of the subjects, and very good results have been obtained in this way. This method was used at the Mousseitbé dispensary in Beirut, and at Ba'albek in the Bekaa' plain.

But first aid and basic health are not intended solely for people at the developing stage. Many sessions are also available for school-children and university students, and special classes are held at regular intervals for workers and leaders of other welfare organizations looking after children, handicapped persons and invalids. Everyone should be

capable of giving first aid in an emergency, just as everyone should know the essential notions of basic health. This is a very important step towards the improvement of public health and, consequently, the welfare of every community.

Voluntary workers

There is a very important point that must be stressed at the conclusion of this report. The Lebanese Red Cross is performing a tremendous job in conditions which, at times, are exceedingly arduous, but it could achieve very little without the many voluntary workers who have willingly come forward to work under the Red Cross flag and who unstintingly give of their time and strength to provide aid for others. By their freely taken decision, they may be truly considered to be among the pick of the nation for, paid or unpaid, they have wholeheartedly thrown themselves into the task.

Without them, without such people always ready to step forward when called upon, who else could have worked without respite in the midst of gunfire, where the smallest movement, the slightest activity could be perilous, and where an attempt to cross a street might bring sudden death?

To perform this work in the midst of civil war, to carry on without ever abandoning one's task, to keep contact notwithstanding the barriers set up by fanaticism and fierce opposition—that is the true Red Cross miracle, the real meaning of its flag, symbolized by “nameless, unremembered acts of heroism”, performed against a shining backcloth of charity.

Marilys Ezzedine

*Member of the Central Committee of
the Lebanese Red Cross*

M I S C E L L A N E O U S

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS

FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE

The United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, convened on the basis of United Nations General Assembly resolutions 32/152 of 19 December 1977, 33/70 of 28 September 1978 and 34/82 of 11 December 1979, met at the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 10 to 28 September 1979 and from 15 September to 10 October 1980.

Eighty-five States participated in the work of the Conference, 82 at the 1979 session, 76 at the 1980 session.

On 10 October 1980, the Conference adopted the following instruments:

1. Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Appendix A)
2. Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I) (Appendix B)
3. Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) (Appendix C)
4. Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons (Protocol III) (Appendix D)

In addition, the Conference at its 1979 session adopted the following resolution:

- Resolution on Small-Calibre Weapon Systems (Appendix E)

The texts of the above-mentioned instruments and resolution are appended to this Final Act.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, signed in Geneva, this tenth day of October 1980,

Oluyemi Adeniji
President of the Conference

Amada Segarra
Executive Secretary of the Conference

APPENDIX A

CONVENTION ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS

The High Contracting Parties,

Recalling that every State has the duty, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations,

Further recalling the general principle of the protection of the civilian population against the effects of hostilities,

Basing themselves on the principle of international law that the right of the parties to an armed conflict to choose methods or means of warfare is not unlimited, and on the principle that prohibits the employment in armed conflicts of weapons, projectiles and material and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering,

Also recalling that it is prohibited to employ methods or means of warfare which are intended, or may be expected, to cause widespread, long-term and severe damage to the natural environment,

Confirming their determination that in cases not covered by this Convention and its annexed Protocols or by other international agreements, the civilian population and the combatants shall at all times remain under the protection and authority of the principles of international law derived from established custom, from the principles of humanity and from the dictates of public conscience,

Desiring to contribute to international détente, the ending of the arms race and the building of confidence among States, and hence to the realization of the aspiration of all peoples to live in peace,

Recognizing the importance of pursuing every effort which may contribute to progress towards general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,

Reaffirming the need to continue the codification and progressive development of the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict,

Wishing to prohibit or restrict further the use of certain conventional weapons and believing that the positive results achieved in this area may facilitate the main talks on disarmament with a view to putting an end to the production, stockpiling and proliferation of such weapons,

Emphasizing the desirability that all States become parties to this Convention and its annexed Protocols, especially the militarily significant States,

Bearing in mind that the General Assembly of the United Nations and the United Nations Disarmament Commission may decide to examine the question of a possible broadening of the scope of the prohibitions and restrictions contained in this Convention and its annexed Protocols,

Further bearing in mind that the Committee on Disarmament may decide to consider the question of adopting further measures to prohibit or restrict the use of certain conventional weapons,

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1 : Scope of application

This Convention and its annexed Protocols shall apply in the situations referred to in Article 2 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the Protection of War Victims, including any situation described in paragraph 4 of Article 1 of Additional Protocol I to these Conventions.

Article 2 : Relations with other international agreements

Nothing in this Convention or its annexed Protocols shall be interpreted as detracting from other obligations imposed upon the High Contracting Parties by international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflict.

Article 3 : Signature

This Convention shall be open for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters in New York for a period of twelve months from 10 April 1981.

Article 4: Ratification, acceptance, approval or accession

1. This Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval by the Signatories. Any State which has not signed this Convention may accede to it.
2. The instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession shall be deposited with the Depositary.
3. Expressions of consent to be bound by any of the Protocols annexed to this Convention shall be optional for each State, provided that at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or of accession thereto, that State shall notify the Depositary of its consent to be bound by any two or more of these Protocols.
4. At any time after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or of accession thereto, a State may notify the Depositary of its consent to be bound by any annexed Protocol by which it is not already bound.
5. Any Protocol by which a High Contracting Party is bound shall for that Party form an integral part of this Convention.

Article 5: Entry into force

1. This Convention shall enter into force six months after the date of deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.
2. For any State which deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession after the date of the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, this Convention shall enter into force six months after the date on which that State has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.
3. Each of the Protocols annexed to this Convention shall enter into force six months after the date by which twenty States have notified their consent to be bound by it in accordance with paragraph 3 or 4 of Article 4 of this Convention.
4. For any State which notifies its consent to be bound by a Protocol, annexed to this Convention after the date by which twenty States have notified their consent to be bound by it, the Protocol shall enter into force six months after the date on which that State has notified its consent so to be bound.

Article 6: Dissemination

The High Contracting Parties undertake, in time of peace as in time of armed conflict, to disseminate this Convention and those of its annexed Protocols by which they are bound as widely as possible in their respective countries and, in particular, to include the study thereof in their programmes of

military instruction, so that those instruments may become known to their armed force.

Article 7: Treaty relations upon entry into force of this Convention

1. When one of the parties to a conflict is not bound by an annexed Protocol, the parties bound by this Convention and that annexed Protocol shall remain bound by them in their mutual relations.

2. Any High Contracting Party shall be bound by this Convention and any Protocol annexed thereto which is in force for it, in any situation contemplated by Article 1, in relation to any State which is not a party to this Convention or bound by the relevant annexed Protocol, if the latter accepts and applies this Convention or the relevant Protocol, and so notifies the Depositary.

3. The Depositary shall immediately inform the High Contracting Parties concerned of any notification received under paragraph 2 of this Article.

4. This Convention, and the annexed Protocols by which a High Contracting Party is bound, shall apply with respect to an armed conflict against that High Contracting Party of the type referred to in Article 1, paragraph 4, of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the Protection of War Victims:

(a) where the High Contracting Party is also a party to Additional Protocol I and an authority referred to in Article 96, paragraph 3, of that Protocol has undertaken to apply the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I in accordance with Article 96, paragraph 3, of the said Protocol, and undertakes to apply this Convention and the relevant annexed Protocols in relation to that conflict; or

(b) where the High Contracting Party is not a party to Additional Protocol I and an authority of the type referred to in subparagraph (a) above accepts and applies the obligations of the Geneva Conventions and of this Convention and the relevant annexed Protocols in relation to that conflict. Such an acceptance and application shall have in relation to that conflict the following effects:

- (i) the Geneva Conventions and this Convention and its relevant annexed Protocols are brought into force for the parties to the conflict with immediate effect;
- (ii) the said authority assumes the same rights and obligations as those which have been assumed by a High Contracting Party to the Geneva Conventions, this Convention and its relevant annexed Protocols; and
- (iii) the Geneva Conventions, this Convention and its relevant annexed Protocols are equally binding upon all parties to the conflict.

The High Contracting Party and the authority may also agree to accept and apply the obligations of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions on a reciprocal basis.

Article 8 : Review and amendments

1. (a) At any time after the entry into force of this Convention any High Contracting Party may propose amendments to this Convention or any annexed Protocol by which it is bound. Any proposal for an amendment shall be communicated to the Depositary, who shall notify it to all the High Contracting Parties and shall seek their views on whether a conference should be convened to consider the proposal. If a majority, that shall not be less than eighteen of the High Contracting Parties so agree, he shall promptly convene a conference to which all High Contracting Parties shall be invited. States not parties to this Convention shall be invited to the conference as observers.

(b) Such a conference may agree upon amendments which shall be adopted and shall enter into force in the same manner as this Convention and the annexed Protocols, provided that amendments to this Convention may be adopted only by the High Contracting Parties and that amendments to a specific annexed Protocol may be adopted only by the High Contracting Parties which are bound by that Protocol.

2. (a) At any time after the entry into force of this Convention any High Contracting Party may propose additional protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing annexed Protocols. Any such proposal for an additional protocol shall be communicated to the Depositary, who shall notify it to all the High Contracting Parties in accordance with subparagraph 1 (a) of this Article. If a majority, that shall not be less than eighteen of the High Contracting Parties so agree, the Depositary shall promptly convene a conference to which all States shall be invited.

(b) Such a conference may agree, with the full participation of all States represented at the conference, upon additional protocols which shall be adopted in the same manner as this Convention, shall be annexed thereto and shall enter into force as provided in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 5 of this Convention.

3. (a) If, after a period of ten years following the entry into force of this Convention, no conference has been convened in accordance with subparagraph 1 (a) or 2 (a) of this Article, any High Contracting Party may request the Depositary to convene a conference to which all High Contracting Parties shall be invited to review the scope and operation of this Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto and to consider any proposal for amendments of this Convention or of the existing Protocols. States not parties to this Convention shall be invited as observers to the conference. The conference may agree upon amendments which shall be adopted and enter into force in accordance with subparagraph 1 (b) above.

(b) At such conference consideration may also be given to any proposal for additional protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing annexed Protocols. All States represented at the conference may participate fully in such consideration. Any additional protocols shall be adopted in the same manner as this Convention, shall be annexed

thereto and shall enter into force as provided in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 5 of this Convention.

(c) Such a conference may consider whether provision should be made for the convening of a further conference at the request of any High Contracting Party if, after a similar period to that referred to in subparagraph 3 (a) of this Article, no conference has been convened in accordance with subparagraph 1 (a) or 2 (a) of this Article.

Article 9 : *Denunciation*

1. Any High Contracting Party may denounce this Convention or any of its annexed Protocols by so notifying the Depositary.

2. Any such denunciation shall only take effect one year after receipt by the Depositary of the notification of denunciation. If, however, on the expiry of that year the denouncing High Contracting Party is engaged in one of the situations referred to in Article 1, the Party shall continue to be bound by the obligations of this Convention and of the relevant annexed Protocols until the end of the armed conflict or occupation and, in any case, until the termination of operations connected with the final release, repatriation or re-establishment of the person protected by the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in the case of any annexed Protocol containing provisions concerning situations in which peace-keeping, observation or similar functions are performed by United Nations forces or missions in the area concerned, until the termination of those functions.

3. Any denunciation of this Convention shall be considered as also applying to all annexed Protocols by which the denouncing High Contracting Party is bound.

4. Any denunciation shall have effect only in respect of the denouncing High Contracting Party.

5. Any denunciation shall not affect the obligations already incurred, by reason of an armed conflict, under this Convention and its annexed Protocols by such denouncing High Contracting Party in respect of any act committed before this denunciation becomes effective.

Article 10 : *Depositary*

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall be the Depositary of this Convention and of its annexed Protocols.

2. In addition to his usual functions, the Depositary shall inform all States of:

(a) signatures affixed to this Convention under Article 3;

(b) deposits of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of or accession to this Convention deposited under Article 4;

(c) notifications of consent to be bound by annexed Protocols under Article 4;

(d) the dates of entry into force of this Convention and of each of its annexed Protocols under Article 5; and

(e) notifications of denunciation received under article 9, and their effective date.

Article 11 : *Authentic texts*

The original of this Convention with the annexed Protocols, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Depositary, who shall transmit certified true copies thereof to all States.

APPENDIX B

PROTOCOL ON NON-DETECTABLE FRAGMENTS (PROTOCOL I)

It is prohibited to use any weapon the primary effect of which is to injure by fragments which in the human body escape detection by X-rays.

APPENDIX C

PROTOCOL ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF MINES, BOOBY TRAPS AND OTHER DEVICES (PROTOCOL II)

Article 1 : *Material scope of application*

This Protocol relates to the use on land of the mines, booby-traps and other devices defined herein, including mines laid to interdict beaches, waterway crossings or river crossings, but does not apply to the use of anti-ship mines at sea or in inland waterways.

Article 2 : *Definitions*

For the purpose of this Protocol:

1. "Mine" means any munition placed under, on or near the ground or other surface area and designed to be detonated or exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person or vehicle, and "remotely delivered mine" means any mine so defined delivered by artillery, rocket, mortar or similar means or dropped from an aircraft.
2. "Booby-trap" means any device or material which is designed, constructed or adapted to kill or injure and which functions unexpectedly when a person disturbs or approaches an apparently harmless object or performs an apparently safe act.
3. "Other devices" means manually-emplaced munitions and devices designed to kill, injure or damage and which are actuated by remote control or automatically after a lapse of time.
4. "Military objective" means, so far as objects are concerned, any object which by its nature, location, purpose or use makes an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.
5. "Civilian objects" are all objects which are not military objectives as defined in paragraph 4.
6. "Recording" means a physical, administrative and technical operation designed to obtain, for the purpose of registration in the official records, all available information facilitating the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps.

Article 3 : *General restrictions on the use of mines, booby-traps and other devices*

1. This Article applies to:
 - (a) mines;
 - (b) booby-traps; and
 - (c) other devices.
2. It is prohibited in all circumstances to direct weapons to which this Article applies, either in offence, defence or by way of reprisals, against the civilian population as such or against individual civilians.
3. The indiscriminate use of weapons to which this Article applies is prohibited. Indiscriminate use is any placement of such weapons:
 - (a) which is not on, or directed at, a military objective; or
 - (b) which employs a method or means of delivery which cannot be directed at a specific military objective; or

(c) which may be expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians, damage to civilian objects, or a combination thereof, which would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated.

4. All feasible precautions shall be taken to protect civilians from the effects of weapons to which this Article applies. Feasible precautions are those precautions which are practicable or practically possible taking into account all circumstances ruling at the time, including humanitarian and military considerations.

Article 4: *Restrictions on the use of mines other than remotely delivered mines, booby-traps and other devices in populated areas*

1. This Article applies to:

- (a) mines other than remotely delivered mines;
- (b) booby-traps; and
- (c) other devices.

2. It is prohibited to use weapons to which this Article applies in any city, town, village or other area containing a similar concentration of civilians in which combat between ground forces is not taking place or does not appear to be imminent, unless either;

(a) they are placed on or in the close vicinity of a military objective belonging to or under the control of an adverse party; or

(b) measures are taken to protect civilians from their effects, for example, the posting of warning signs, the posting of sentries, the issue of warnings or the provision of fences.

Article 5: *Restrictions on the use of remotely delivered mines*

1. The use of remotely delivered mines is prohibited unless such mines are only used within an area which is itself a military objective or which contains military objectives, and unless:

(a) their location can be accurately recorded in accordance with Article 7 (1) (a); or

(b) an effective neutralizing mechanism is used on each such mine, that is to say, a self-actuating mechanism which is designed to render a mine harmless or cause it to destroy itself when it is anticipated that the mine will no longer serve the military purpose for which it was placed in position, or a remotely-controlled mechanism which is designed to render harmless or destroy a mine when the mine no longer serves the military purpose for which it was placed in position.

2. Effective advance warning shall be given of any delivery or dropping of remotely delivered mines which may affect the civilian population, unless circumstances do not permit.

Article 6 : *Prohibition on the use of certain booby-traps*

1. Without prejudice to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict relating to treachery and perfidy, it is prohibited in all circumstances to use:

(a) any booby-trap in the form of an apparently harmless portable object which is specifically designed and constructed to contain explosive material and to detonate when it is disturbed or approached, or

(b) booby-traps which are in any way attached to or associated with:

- (i) internationally recognized protective emblems, signs or signals;
- (ii) sick, wounded or dead persons;
- (iii) burial or cremation sites or graves;
- (iv) medical facilities, medical equipment, medical supplies or medical transportation;
- (v) children's toys or other portable objects or products specially designed for the feeding, health, hygiene, clothing or education of children;
- (vi) food or drink;
- (vii) kitchen utensils or appliances except in military establishments, military locations or military supply depots;
- (viii) objects clearly of a religious nature;
- (ix) historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples;
- (x) animals or their carcasses.

2. It is prohibited in all circumstances to use any booby-trap which is designed to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering.

Article 7 : *Recording and publication of the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps*

1. The parties to a conflict shall record the location of:

(a) all pre-planned minefields laid by them; and

(b) all areas in which they have made large-scale and pre-planned use of booby-traps.

2. The parties shall endeavour to ensure the recording of the location of all other minefields, mines and booby-traps which they have laid or placed in position.

3. All such records shall be retained by the parties who shall:

(a) immediately after the cessation of active hostilities:

- (i) take all necessary and appropriate measures, including the use of such records, to protect civilians from the effects of minefields, mines and booby-traps; and either

- (ii) in cases where the forces of neither party are in the territory of the adverse party, make available to each other and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations all information in their possession concerning the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps in the territory of the adverse party; or
- (iii) once complete withdrawal of the forces of the parties from the territory of the adverse party has taken place, make available to the adverse party and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations all information in their possession concerning the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps in the territory of the adverse party;
- (b) when a United Nations force or mission performs functions in any area, make available to the authority mentioned in Article 8 such information as is required by that Article;
- (c) whenever possible, by mutual agreement, provide for the release of information concerning the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps, particularly in agreements governing the cessation of hostilities.

Article 8: Protection of United Nations forces and missions from the effects of minefields, mines and booby-traps

1. When a United Nations force or mission performs functions of peace-keeping, observation or similar functions in any area, each party to the conflict shall, if requested by the head of the United Nations force or mission in that area, as far as it is able:

- (a) remove or render harmless all mines or booby-traps in that area;
- (b) take such measures as may be necessary to protect the force or mission from the effects of minefields, mines and booby-traps while carrying out its duties; and
- (c) make available to the head of the United Nations force or mission in that area, all information in the party's possession concerning the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps in that area.

2. When a United Nations fact-finding mission performs functions in any area, any party to the conflict concerned shall provide protection to that mission except where, because of the size of such mission, it cannot adequately provide such protection. In that case it shall make available to the head of the mission the information in its possession concerning the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps in that area.

Article 9: International co-operation in the removal of minefields, mines and booby-traps

After the cessation of active hostilities, the parties shall endeavour to reach agreement, both among themselves and, where appropriate, with other States and with international organizations, on the provision of information and

technical and material assistance—including, in appropriate circumstances, joint operations—necessary to remove or otherwise render ineffective minefields, mines and booby-traps placed in position during the conflict.

TECHNICAL ANNEX TO THE PROTOCOL ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF MINES, BOOBY-TRAPS AND OTHER DEVICES (PROTOCOL II)

Guidelines on recording

Whenever an obligation for the recording of the location of minefields, mines and booby-traps arises under the Protocol, the following guidelines shall be taken into account.

1. With regard to pre-planned minefields and large-scale and pre-planned use of booby-traps:

(a) maps, diagrams or other records should be made in such a way as to indicate the extent of the minefield or booby-trapped area; and

(b) the location of the minefield or booby-trapped area should be specified by relation to the co-ordinates of a single reference point and by the estimated dimensions of the area containing mines and booby-traps in relation to that single reference point.

2. With regard to other minefields, mines and booby-traps laid or placed in position:

In so far as possible, the relevant information specified in paragraph 1 above should be recorded so as to enable the areas containing minefields, mines and booby-traps to be identified.

APPENDIX D

PROTOCOL ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF INCENDIARY WEAPONS (PROTOCOL III)

Article 1 : *Definitions*

For the purpose of this Protocol:

1. “Incendiary weapon” means any weapon or munition which is primarily designed to set fire to objects or to cause burn injury to persons through the action of flame, heat, or a combination thereof, produced by a chemical reaction of a substance delivered on the target.

(a) Incendiary weapons can take the form of, for example, flame throwers, fougasses, shells, rockets, grenades, mines, bombs and other containers of incendiary substances.

(b) Incendiary weapons do not include:

- (i) Munitions which may have incidental incendiary effects, such as illuminants, tracers, smoke or signalling systems;
 - (ii) Munitions designed to combine penetration, blast or fragmentation effects with an additional incendiary effect, such as armour-piercing projectiles, fragmentation shells, explosive bombs and similar combined-effects munitions in which the incendiary effect is not specifically designed to cause burn injury to persons, but to be used against military objectives, such as armoured vehicles, aircraft and installations or facilities.
2. "Concentration of civilians" means any concentration of civilians, be it permanent or temporary, such as in inhabited parts of cities, or inhabited towns or villages, or as in camps or columns of refugees or evacuees, or groups of nomads.
 3. "Military objective" means, so far as objects are concerned, any object which by its nature, location, purpose or use makes an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.
 4. "Civilian objects" are all objects which are not military objectives as defined in paragraph 3.
 5. "Feasible precautions" are those precautions which are practicable or practically possible taking into account all circumstances ruling at the time, including humanitarian and military considerations.

Article 2: *Protection of civilians and civilian objects*

1. It is prohibited in all circumstances to make the civilian population as such, individual civilians or civilian objects the object of attack by incendiary weapons.
2. It is prohibited in all circumstances to make any military objective located within a concentration of civilians the object of attack by air-delivered incendiary weapons.
3. It is further prohibited to make any military objective located within a concentration of civilians the object of attack by means of incendiary weapons other than air-delivered incendiary weapons, except when such military objective is clearly separated from the concentration of civilians and all feasible precautions are taken with a view to limiting the incendiary effects to the military objective and to avoiding, and in any event to minimizing, incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians and damage to civilian objects.
4. It is prohibited to make forests or other kinds of plant cover the object of attack by incendiary weapons except when such natural elements are used to cover, conceal or camouflage combatants or other military objectives, or are themselves military objectives.

APPENDIX E

RESOLUTION ON SMALL-CALIBRE WEAPON SYSTEMS

Adopted by the Conference at its 7th plenary meeting, 23 September 1979

The United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons,

Recalling United Nations General Assembly resolution 32/152 of 19 December 1977,

Aware of the continuous development of small-calibre weapon systems (i.e., arms and projectiles),

Anxious to prevent an unnecessary increase of the injurious effects of such weapon systems,

Recalling the agreement embodied in The Hague Declaration of 29 July 1899, to abstain, in international armed conflict, from the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body,

Convinced that it is desirable to establish accurately the wounding effects of current and new generations of small calibre weapon systems including the various parameters that affect the energy transfer and the wounding mechanism of such systems,

1. *Takes note* with appreciation of the intensive research carried out nationally and internationally in the area of wound ballistics, in particular relating to small-calibre weapon systems, as documented during the Conference;
 2. *Considers* that this research and the international discussion on the subject has led to an increased understanding of the wounding effects of small-calibre weapon systems and of the parameters involved;
 3. *Believes* that such research, including testing of small-calibre weapon systems, should be continued with a view to developing standardized assessment methodology relative to ballistic parameters and medical effects of such systems;
 4. *Invites* Governments to carry out further research, jointly or individually, on the wounding effects of small-calibre weapon systems and to communicate, where possible, their findings and conclusions;
 5. *Welcomes* the announcement that an international scientific symposium on wound ballistics will be held in Gothenburg, Sweden, in late 1980 or in 1981, and hopes that the results of the symposium will be made available to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the Committee on Disarmament and other interested fora;
 6. *Appeals* to all Governments to exercise the utmost care in the development of small-calibre weapon systems, so as to avoid an unnecessary escalation of the injurious effects of such systems.
-

BOOKS AND REVIEWS

HOWARD S. LEVIE: PROTECTION OF WAR VICTIMS ¹

There are, of course, in addition to the seventeen-volume *Official Records* of the 1974-77 Diplomatic Conference, a number of books and articles which set out to present and describe part or all of the two June 1977 Protocols. Mr. Levie's book, with no comments, gives in chronological order and easily accessible form for nearly every article of Protocol I all relevant conference documents, including some not contained in the *Official Records*. So that the book could be kept to a reasonable size, some lesser articles of the Protocol have been dealt with very briefly.

This method of presentation will no doubt be useful as a ready reference instead of the cumbersome *Official Records*. Its clear and methodic layout will frequently dispense with the need for long and uncertain research through a pile of documents.

This first volume of a series is noteworthy as much for the immense amount of work it undoubtedly entailed as for the invaluable service it will render to research workers and anyone concerned with the 1977 Protocol I. Three further volumes are expected to be issued in 1980 and 1981.

B. Zimmermann.

¹ Howard S. Levie, *Protection of War Victims: Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Conventions*, Vol. I, XXX + 542 pp., Oceana Publications, New York, 1979.

ADDRESSES OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES

- AFGHANISTAN (Democratic Republic) — Afghan Red Crescent, Pul-i Artan, *Kabul*.
- PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA — Albanian Red Cross, 35, Rruga e Barrikadave, *Tirana*.
- ALGERIA (Democratic and People's Republic) — Algerian Red Crescent Society, 15 bis, Boulevard Mohamed V, *Algiers*.
- ARGENTINA — Argentine Red Cross, H. Yrigoyen 2068, 1089 *Buenas Aires*.
- AUSTRALIA — Australian Red Cross, 206, Clarendon Street, *East Melbourne 3002*.
- AUSTRIA — Austrian Red Cross, 3 Gusshausstrasse, Postfach 39, *Vienna 4*.
- BAHAMAS — Bahamas Red Cross Society, P.O. Box N 91, *Nassau*.
- BAHRAIN — Bahrain Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 882, *Manama*.
- BANGLADESH — Bangladesh Red Cross Society, 34, Bangabandhu Avenue, *Dacca 2*.
- PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BENIN — Red Cross of Benin, B.P. 1, *Porto Novo*.
- BELGIUM — Belgian Red Cross, 98 Chaussée de Vleurgat, 1050 *Brussels*.
- BOLIVIA — Bolivian Red Cross, Avenida Simón Bolívar, 1515, *La Paz*.
- BOTSWANA — Botswana Red Cross Society, Independence Avenue, P.O. Box 485, *Gaborone*.
- BRAZIL — Brazilian Red Cross, Praça Cruz Vermelha 10-12, *Rio de Janeiro*.
- BULGARIA — Bulgarian Red Cross, 1, Boul. Buzarov, *Sofia 27*.
- BURMA (Socialist Republic of the Union of) — Burma Red Cross, 42 Strand Road, Red Cross Building, *Rangoon*.
- BURUNDI — Red Cross Society of Burundi, rue du Marché 3, P.O. Box 324, *Bujumbura*.
- CAMEROON — Cameroon Red Cross Society, rue Henry-Dunant, P.O.B. 631, *Yaoundé*.
- CANADA — Canadian Red Cross, 95 Wellesley Street East, *Toronto, Ontario, M4Y 1H6*.
- CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC — Central African Red Cross, B.P. 1428, *Bangui*.
- CHILE — Chilean Red Cross, Avenida Santa María 0150, Correo 21, Casilla 246V., *Santiago*.
- CHINA (People's Republic) — Red Cross Society of China, 53 Kanmien Hutung, *Peking*.
- COLOMBIA — Colombian Red Cross, Carrera 7a, 34-65, Apartado nacional 1110, *Bagatá D.E.*
- CONGO, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF THE — Croix-Rouge Congolaise, place de la Paix, *Brazzaville*.
- COSTA RICA — Costa Rican Red Cross, Calle 14, Avenida 8, Apartado 1025, *San José*.
- CUBA — Cuban Red Cross, Calle 23 201 esq. N. Vedado, *Havana*.
- CZECHOSLOVAKIA — Czechoslovak Red Cross, Thunovska 18, 118 04 *Prague 1*.
- DENMARK — Danish Red Cross, Dag Hammarskjöld's Allé 28, Postboks 2600, 2100 København Ø.
- DOMINICAN REPUBLIC — Dominican Red Cross, Apartado Postal 1293, *Santa Domingo*.
- ECUADOR — Ecuadorian Red Cross, Calle de la Cruz Roja y Avenida Colombia, 118, *Quito*.
- EGYPT (Arab Republic of) — Egyptian Red Crescent Society, 29, El-Galaa Street, *Cairo*.
- EL SALVADOR — El Salvador Red Cross, 3a Avenida Norte y 3a Calle Poniente, *San Salvador, C.A.*
- ETHIOPIA — Ethiopian Red Cross, Rass Desta Damtew Avenue, *Addis Ababa*.
- FIJI — Fiji Red Cross Society, 193 Rodwell Road, P.O. Box 569, *Suva*.
- FINLAND — Finnish Red Cross, Tehtaankatu I A, Box 168, 00141 *Helsinki 1415*.
- FRANCE — French Red Cross, 17 rue Quentin Bauchart, F-75384 *Paris CEDEX 08*.
- GAMBIA — The Gambia Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 472, *Banjul*.
- GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — German Red Cross in the German Democratic Republic, Kaitzerstrasse 2, DDR 801 *Dresden 1*.
- GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF — German Red Cross in the Federal Republic of Germany, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 71, 5300, *Bonn 1*, Postfach (D.B.R.).
- GHANA — Ghana Red Cross, National Headquarters, Ministries Annex A3, P.O. Box 835, *Accra*.
- GREECE — Hellenic Red Cross, rue Lyeavittou 1, *Athens 135*.
- GUATEMALA — Guatemalan Red Cross, 3a Calle 8-40, Zona 1, *Ciudad de Guatemala*.
- GUYANA — Guyana Red Cross, P.O. Box 351, Eve Leary, *Georgetown*.
- HAITI — Haiti Red Cross, Place des Nations Unies, B.P. 1337, *Port-au-Prince*.
- HONDURAS — Honduran Red Cross, 7a Calle, 1a y 2a Avenidas, *Camayagüela, D.M.*
- HUNGARY — Hungarian Red Cross, V. Arany János utca 31, *Budapest V*, Mail Add.: 1367 *Budapest 5*, Pf. 249.
- ICELAND — Icelandic Red Cross, Nóatúni 21, 105 *Reykjavik*.
- INDIA — Indian Red Cross, 1 Red Cross Road, *New Delhi 110001*.
- INDONESIA — Indonesian Red Cross, Jalan Abdul Muis 66, P.O. Box 2009, *Djakarta*.
- IRAN — Iranian Red Crescent, Avenue Ostad Nejatollahi, Carrefour Ayatollah Taleghani, *Tehran*.
- IRAQ — Iraqi Red Crescent, Al-Mansour, *Baghdad*.
- IRELAND — Irish Red Cross, 16 Merrion Square, *Dublin 2*.
- ITALY — Italian Red Cross, 12 via Toseana, *Rome*.
- IVORY COAST — Ivory Coast Red Cross Society, B.P. 1244, *Abidjan*.
- JAMAICA — Jamaica Red Cross Society, 76 Arnold Road, *Kingston 5*.
- JAPAN — Japanese Red Cross, 1-3 Shiba-Daimon 1-chome, Minato-Ku, *Tokyo 105*.
- JORDAN — Jordan National Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 10 001, *Amman*.
- KENYA — Kenya Red Cross Society, St. John's Gate, P.O. Box 40712, *Nairobi*.
- KOREA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF — Red Cross Society of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, *Pyeongyang*.
- KOREA, REPUBLIC OF — The Republic of Korea National Red Cross, 32-3Ka Nam San-Dong, *Seoul*.
- KUWAIT — Kuwait Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 1350, *Kuwait*.
- LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — Lao Red Cross, P.B. 650, *Vientiane*.
- LEBANON — Lebanese Red Cross, rue Spears, *Beirut*.
- LESOTHO — Lesotho Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 366, *Maseru*.

- LIBERIA** — Libcrian National Red Cross, National Headquarters, 107 Lynch Street, P.O. Box 226, *Moaravia*.
- LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA** — Libyan Arab Red Crescent, P.O. Box 541, *Benghazi*.
- LIECHTENSTEIN** — Liechtenstein Red Cross, *Vaduz*.
- LUXEMBOURG** — Luxembourg Red Cross, Parc de la Ville, C.P. 404, *Luxembourg*.
- MALAGASY REPUBLIC** — Red Cross Society of the Malagasy Republic, rue Patrice Lumumba, *Antananariva*.
- MALAWI** — Malawi Red Cross, Hall Road, *Blantyre* (P.O. Box 30080, Chichiri, *Blantyre* 3).
- MALAYSIA** — Malaysian Red Crescent Society, JKR 2358, Jalan Tun Ismail, *Kuala Lumpur* 11-02.
- MALI** — Mali Red Cross, B.P. 280, *Bamako*.
- MAURITANIA** — Mauritanian Red Crescent Society, B.P. 344, Avenue Gamal Abdel Nasser, *Nouakchott*.
- MAURITIUS** — Mauritius Red Cross, Stc Thérèse Street, *Curepipe*.
- MEXICO** — Mexican Red Cross, Avenida Ejército Nacional n° 1032, *México* 10 D.F.
- MONACO** — Red Cross of Monaco, 27 boul. de Suisse, *Monte Carlo*.
- MONGOLIA** — Red Cross Society of the Mongolian People's Republic, Central Post Office, Post Box 537, *Ulaan Bator*.
- MOROCCO** — Moroccan Red Crescent, B.P. 189, *Rabat*.
- NEPAL** — Nepal Red Cross Society, Tahachal, P.B. 217, *Kathmandu*.
- NETHERLANDS** — Netherlands Red Cross, 27 Prinsessegracht, *The Hague*.
- NEW ZEALAND** — New Zealand Red Cross, Red Cross House, 14 Hill Street, *Wellington* 1. (P.O. Box 12-140, *Wellington* North.)
- NICARAGUA** — Nicaragua Red Cross, D.N. Apartado 3279, *Managua*.
- NIGER** — Red Cross Society of Niger, B.P. 386, *Niamey*.
- NIGERIA** — Nigerian Red Cross Society, Eko Aketa Close, off St. Gregory Rd., P.O. Box 764, *Lagos*.
- NORWAY** — Norwegian Red Cross, Drammensveien 20 A, *Oslo* 2, Mail add.: *Pastbaks* 2338, *Salli, Oslo* 2.
- PAKISTAN** — Pakistan Red Crescent Society, National Headquarters, 169, Sarwar Road, *Rawalpindi*.
- PAPUA NEW GUINEA** — Red Cross of Papua New Guinea, P.O. Box 6545, *Baroka*.
- PANAMA** — Panamanian Red Cross, Apartado Postal 668, Zona 1, *Panama*.
- PARAGUAY** — Paraguayan Red Cross, Brasil 216, *Asunción*.
- PERU** — Peruvian Red Cross, Jirón Chancay 881, *Lima*.
- PHILIPPINES** — Philippine National Red Cross, 860 United Nations Avenue, P.O.B. 280, *Manila* D 2803.
- POLAND** — Polish Red Cross, Mokotowska 14, *Warsaw*.
- PORTUGAL** — Portuguese Red Cross, Jardim 9 Abril, I a 5, *Lisbon* 3.
- ROMANIA** — Red Cross of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Suada Biserica Anzei 29, *Bucarest*.
- SAN MARINO** — San Marino Red Cross, Palais gouvernemental, *San Marino*.
- SAUDI ARABIA** — Saudi Arabian Red Crescent, *Riyadh*.
- SENEGAL** — Senegalese Red Cross Society, Bd Franklin-Roosevelt, P.O.B. 299, *Dakar*.
- SIERRA LEONE** — Sierra Leone Red Cross Society, 6A Liverpool Street, P.O.B. 427, *Freetown*.
- SINGAPORE** — Singapore Red Cross Society, 15 Penang Lane, *Singapore* 0923.
- SOMALIA (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC)** — Somali Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 937, *Mogadishu*.
- SOUTH AFRICA** — South African Red Cross, Cor. Kruis & Market Streets, P.O.B. 8726, *Johannesburg* 2001.
- SPAIN** — Spanish Red Cross, Eduardo Dato 16, *Madrid* 10.
- SRI LANKA (Dem. Soc. Rep. of)** — Sri Lanka Red Cross Society, 106 Dharmapala Mawatha, *Colombo* 7.
- SUDAN** — Sudanese Red Crescent, P.O. Box 235, *Khartoum*.
- SWAZILAND** — Baphalali Swaziland Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 377, *Mbabane*.
- SWEDEN** — Swedish Red Cross, Fack, S-104 40 *Stockholm* 14.
- SWITZERLAND** — Swiss Red Cross, Rainmattstr. 10, B.P. 2699, *3001 Berne*.
- SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC** — Syrian Red Crescent, Bd Mahdi Ben Barake, *Damascus*.
- TANZANIA** — Tanzania Red Cross Society, Upanga Road, P.O.B. 1133, *Dares Salaam*.
- THAILAND** — Thai Red Cross Society, Paribatra Building, Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, *Bangkok*.
- TOGO** — Togolese Red Cross Society, 51 rue Boko Soga, P.O. Box 655, *Lomé*.
- TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO** — Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society, Wrightson Road West, P.O. Box 357, *Port of Spain*, Trinidad, West Indies.
- TUNISIA** — Tunisian Red Crescent, 19 rue d'Angleterre, *Tunis*.
- TURKEY** — Turkish Red Crescent, Yenisehir, *Ankara*.
- UGANDA** — Uganda Red Cross, Nabunya Road, P.O. Box 494, *Kampala*.
- UNITED KINGDOM** — British Red Cross, 9 Grosvenor Crescent, *London, SW1X 7EJ*.
- UPPER VOLTA** — Upper Volta Red Cross, P.O.B. 340, *Ouagadougou*.
- URUGUAY** — Uruguayan Red Cross, Avenida 8 de Octubre 2990, *Montevideo*.
- U.S.A.** — American National Red Cross, 17th and D Streets, N.W., *Washington, D.C.* 20006.
- U.S.S.R.** — Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, I. Tcheremushkinskii proezd 5, *Moscow* 117036.
- VENEZUELA** — Venezuelan Red Cross, Avenida Andrés Bello No. 4, Apart. 3185, *Caracas*.
- VIET NAM, SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF** — Red Cross of Viet Nam, 68 rue Bà-Triệu, *Hanoi*.
- YUGOSLAVIA** — Red Cross of Yugoslavia, Simina ulica broj 19, *Belgrade*.
- REPUBLIC OF ZAIRE** — Red Cross of the Republic of Zaïre, 41 av. de la Justice, B.P. 1712, *Kinshasa*.
- ZAMBIA** — Zambia Red Cross, P.O. Box R.W.1, 2837 Brentwood Drive, *Lusaka*.